26711

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* Arnd Bohm

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* The Literary Treatment of the Thirty Years' War in Selected Works of German Literature

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* University of Alberta.

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/*GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* Master of Arts.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. H. Pausch.

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* 23 9 75 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Arnd Bohm

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ* 9315 154 St
Edmonton Alberta
Canada

NL-91 (3-74)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE LITERARY TREATMENT OF THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR IN SELECTED WORKS OF GERMAN LITERATURE

by

© ARND BOHM

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE LITERARY TREATMENT OF THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR IN SELECTED WORKS OF GERMAN LITERATURE

submitted by ARND BOHM

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of ARTS

Holger Pausch
Supervisor

Eugene Egert

Annelise Thimme

Date Sept. 22 1978

ABSTRACT

Despite its frequent occurrence as a subject or a setting for German historical literature, the theme of the Thirty Years' War has not recently been examined. This study examines the question of how different authors conceived of the Thirty Years' War, and how they communicated this conception in their works. The approach taken is rather phenomenological than positivistic, so that the "accuracy" of the literature against historical studies or against documents is considered less important than the texts themselves.

The representative works dealt with in chronological order are: Grimmelshausen's Der Abentheuerliche Simplicissimus, Schiller's Wallenstein trilogy, Droste-Hülshoff's ballad "Die Schlacht im Loener Bruch," Stifter's Der Hochwald, Raabe's Else von der Tanne, Meyer's Gustav Adolfs Page, Döblin's Wallenstein and Brecht's Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder.

In each case, the treatment of the Thirty Years' War may be seen as the product of a number of interacting factors, so that the treatment undergoes change. There is a common effort to make the Thirty Years' War theme relevant to the author's present, and an increasing awareness of the subjectivity and malleability of historical accounts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My debt to three writers whose works do not appear in the notes, but who made it possible to begin should be acknowledged. They are W. S. Merwin, Francis Ponge, and Henry S. Kariel.

I am especially grateful to Dr. H. Pausch for his patient assistance.

It is not possible to name all the other people who made it possible for me to keep going and to finish this thesis. To them I offer the best thanks I have: a resolution to do better.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	History, Literature, the Thirty Years' War	1
II.	Grimmelshausen's Der Abentheuerliche Simplicissimus	13
III.	Schiller's Wallenstein	34
IV.	The Nineteenth Century	57
	Annette von Droste-Hülshoff's "Die Schlacht im Loener Bruch"	60
	Adalbert Stifter's Der Hochwald	70
	Wilhelm Raabe's Else von der Tanne	75
	Conrad Ferdinand Meyer's Gustav Adolfs Page	84
V.	Döblin's Wallenstein	92
VI.	Brecht's Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder	113
VII.	Perspectives: War and the Literature of War	140
Selected Bibliography		145
Appendix: Brief Chronology of the Thirty Years' War		157

CHAPTER I

HISTORY, LITERATURE, THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR

As GÜnter Grass has pointed out, the Thirty Years' War has been and is likely to remain a subject for treatment in German literature.[1] However, no recent attempt has been made to examine the portrayal of the Thirty Years' War on the basis of several works.[2] Studies on a specific work which deals with the Thirty Years' War often refer to some other works which involve the same topic, so that for example discussions of Brecht's Mutter Courage will sometimes mention Grimmelshausen as a source, but these have not been brought together under one rubric. Proceeding from this situation, this study will compare and contrast several of the works on the Thirty Years' War from different times and genres in order to enrich the understanding of the specific text and to distinguish some patterns in the treatment of the theme.

Necessarily, this study will have an interdisciplinary bent, since one cannot avoid crossing into history when examining historical literature.[3] In doing so, the recent developments which have transformed the theoretical analysis of history will be taken into account, but the "accuracy" of the portrayals of the Thirty Years' War will not be assessed. Literary studies which have that primary goal generally rest upon the assumption that history is a simple given, a series of facts which are real and readily comprehended in the apprehension. This positivistic view of history does not agree well with the feeling that the analysis of historical literary texts is itself difficult, complex, and requires a

good deal of subtlety.

Perhaps it is symptomatic of a sceptical age that the positivistic views of history and of reality should be considered untenable, but support for the rejection of the positivist views comes from several different directions. On the one hand, the physicists' knowledge of the theoretical limitations upon objectivity has undermined the solid foundation of the natural sciences. Similarly, phenomenological philosophy, which set out to provide a fundament for the sciences, succeeded mainly in alerting us to the fact that:

> The perception of a tree, the practical know-how for handling a tool, the enjoyment of a painting, the interpretation of a scriptural text, the insight into a theorem of geometry, the interpretation of the spirit of an age, or of a primitve myth, or of a dream, or of the sense of an entire tradition, all involve different ways of knowing . . . . ,[4]

leaving us with the consolation that the more careful the interpreter is, the more likely the interpretation is to be meaningful. Literary criticism, under the impact of not only phenomenology, but also of minute, acute linguistic studies and of the proliferation of methods, in the meantime came to virtually the same conclusion: the better the reader and the reading are, the richer the experience of the text will be.[5] Not surprisingly, historians were also concerned with basic questions about the nature of their enterprise, and there too a consensus seems to have emerged that objectivity and truth must be specially qualified to be meaningful, and that they are dependent upon a knowledgeable response to complex entities.

The point of this is that now, in any attempt to discuss historical literature, one is caught at the crossroads of these trends,

where there is very little firm footing. Literary interpretation which restricts itself to the text, which is "work immanent," is not sufficient to deal completely with historical literature. By its very nature, such literature, striving to transcend personal experience, cannot be made fully accessible without reference to a world external to the text. But how is this to be done when that outside world does not exist to the reader except through other documents? History is not there in the way that a chair or an apple are: it is an abstraction from collected, cumulated, and interpreted documentation of individual experience. Strange as it might initially seem, one cannot distinguish the writing of history from the writing of literature except in what they intend.[6]

If one believes positivistically in historical reality, it is not too difficult to analyze historical literature as either a verification or a falsification of that reality. It becomes then basically a question of mensuration and comparison: how far is a given novel or drama from the "facts" embodied in historical works, how free of anachronisms or fabrications is it, how "realistically" does it mirror the "Zeitgeist"? As literary criticism, such an approach can lead to some rather doubtful results, though. One example may suffice here. In discussing Grillparzer's Ein Bruderzwist in Hamburg, George A. Wells begins by presenting "a brief account of the historical facts" and then indicates that ". . . Grillparzer simplified the facts not only for greater clarity, but also because of his interpretation of Rudolf's character." Wells goes on to mention: "As a further of example of Grillparzer's adaptation of the facts . . . that the historical Rudolf remains in

office because he knows of no competent successor . . . ."[7] But who is to say so surely who the "historical Rudolf" was, or what motivated him? It is by no means obvious that Wells's source for his interpretation of Rudolf, Ranke's Vom Religionsfrieden bis zum dreissigjährigen Krieg,[8] is any more factual than Grillparzer's dramatization. Despite his fame as the historian who called for the writing of history "the way it really was," Ranke remained after all subject to the limitations of being in the world as a human being, his books as texts must be considered the same as Grillparzer's dramas, and his interpretations must be treated with no undue respect where they concern matters of understanding others. Although one cannot deny that there was a series of events before now which may be called historical reality, there is no access to them and their interpretation except through the filter of human experience. Recognizing this makes the praise one sometimes finds accorded to historical novels, that they are good because they present the accurate picture of the times, somewhat hollow, since there is no accessible absolute standard for comparison.

One is therefore confronted by something of a dilemma. Reference to actual history is necessary for the interpretation of historical literature, but upon examination, "actual history" proves to be a chimera. How can one then proceed with an examination of the literary treatment of the Thirty Years' War? Admittedly, my way out of this dilemma is through a back door. Rather than presenting at the outset factual, i.e. uninterpreted information about the Thirty Years' War, as one might present a hypothesis before proceeding with an experiment, I shall assume that most readers

will have some prior knowledge of the war. Hopefully, it will be possible to ask the reader to temporarily place such knowledge aside, in mental quotation marks or brackets. In other words, the reader is asked to pretend that he knows nothing about the Thirty Years' War, and hence cannot make judgements about the accuracy of a given treatment of the war, although he must know enough about the subject to be able to follow the discussion.[9] The questions that can then and will be directed to the texts will fall into three major categories: 1. How does the author conceive of the Thirty Years' War? Here, some reference to the author's concepts of war and of history will in most cases be unavoidable. 2. How is the author's conception communicated or narrated? 3. What function does the use of the Thirty Years' War as a subject matter have within the work?

One further argument for the necessity of the bracketing of prior knowledge about the Thirty Years' War may be made on the basis of a more concrete consideration, namely that that prior knowledge may be inaccurate. For example, it is the ususally received opinion, held not only by those whose primary interests are outside the discipline of history, but also by historians, that the Thirty Years' War was a time when terrible destruction was wreaked on Germany, when the population was severely reduced and the countryside ravaged by the opposing armies of brutal mercenaries. Representative of the "disaster school" is the picture painted in lurid colours by Johann Howald in a history of German literature around the turn of this century:

> . . . wir wollen nicht in Detail wiederholen, was so oft schon geschildert worden, wollen an den

> Schwedentrunk und andere Greuel nur im Vorübergehen erinnern. Als endlich die Friedenstrompeten ertönten, war Deutschland eine Wüste, seine Städte verheert, seine Dörfer verbrannt, seine Bewohner um mehr als zwei Drittel vermindert, seine Fürsten Drahtpuppen fremder Herren, sein Adel der Heimat und dem Volke entfremdet, seine Bürger verarmt, seine Bauern vertiert, seine Frauen entehrt, sein Ruhm dahin, sein Volksbewusstsein untergegangen in verblendeter Ausländerei; die Fäden des Zusammenhangs mit seiner früheren Kunst und Kultur waren fast alle abgerissen.[10]

Equally eloquent on the atrocities of the "most confused and horrible of all modern wars"[11] was the admittedly popularizing American historian Lynn Montross several decades later:

> After eighteen years of strife Germany had become a pit of despair in which a losing commander could always recruit another army. Wild beasts lurked in the blackened ruins of towns whose inhabitants had taken to the woods like wild beasts. Plague and famine carried off thousands of victims every month, in addition to those maimed and butchered by a wanton soldiery. Cannibalism grew so rife that bodies were torn from the gallows by hunger-maddened folk, and throughout the Rhineland the very graveyards were guarded because of the traffic in human flesh.[12]

The very fact that the same images recur from one of these horror accounts to the next should act as a warning signal that these are clichés well on their way to becoming archetypal. Unfortunately, the case can be made that there is no or very little support for them.

The two recent major historical critics of the so-called "disaster school," Robert Ergang and S.H. Steinberg, point out that the great difficulty in evaluating the effects of the Thirty Years' War is a lack of reliable information.[13] In the absence of censuses or other reliable statistics, argues Steinberg, "All assertions of a decline of the population during the war by one-

third or even more are . . . baseless guesswork."[14] Many people perhaps fell victim to disease, but the battles were not responsible for a great number of deaths, since the armies were generally quite small.[15] The villages and towns which were supposedly emptied as a result of depopulation were either deserted long since or serve as indications that the population moved elsewhere. Even where an urban centre was destroyed, the destruction was not permanent, for "those villages that were wholly or partly burned down by the soldiery in the course of the war were all rebuilt and even enlarged before the end of it; and the same is true of Magdeburg, the only town of any size to be severely damaged by enemy action."[16] Most of the atrocity accounts came from propagandistic broadsheets and bulletins, and none of the stories of cannibalism has been substantiated.[17] Whether the economy declined as a result of the war or had begun to decline earlier, and whether the decline was relative or absolute if there was one, remain moot points.[18] The talk of cultural desolation is certainly refuted by the achievements in the sciences and in literature.[19]

While other historians have criticized both Ergang and Steinberg for overstating their case, such internecine controversies emphasize the fact that it will not do to simply claim that the Thirty Years' War was a time of horror and destruction, and then use that claim to explain either the quality of Baroque literature or to make specific demands of the literature which deals with the Thirty Years' War. Ultimately, nothing of significance is absolutely known to be true about the past (or the present), and one may not <u>a priori</u> assume that any necessary pattern inheres in human

events. What is of interest nevertheless, and what shall be examined in this thesis, is how authors respond to this circumstance, and what shapes they give to their histories. By initially questioning common assumptions about the Thirty Years' War and holding them in temporary abeyance, it should be possible to see historical literature which deals with that infinitely complex event in a different light.

Notes to Chapter I

1 "Über meinen Lehrer Döblin," Akzente, 14 (1967), 296.

2 One of the few such studies is Konrad Studentkowski, Der dreissigjahrige Krieg im Spiegel der historischen Novelle. Ein Beitrag zur Stoffgeschichte und zur Geschichte der historischen Novelle (Jena: Fromannsche Buchhandlung, 1934). Studentkowski included not only novelles in his bibliography but also larger works on the Thirty Years' War, pp. 125-138. Eberhard Knobloch points out in Die Wortwahl in der archaisierenden chronikalischen Erzahlung: Meinhold, Raabe, Storm, Wille, Kolbenheyer (Goppingen: Alfred Kummerle, 1971), p. 131, note 119, that Studentkowski missed listing Bruno Wille's Die Abendburg (Jena, 1920).

Other works on the Thirty Years' War may be found through Arthur Luther, Deutsche Geschichte in deutscher Erzählung. Ein literarisches Lexikon (Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1943), pp. 138-170; and Wilhelm Kosch, Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon. Biographisches und bibliographisches Handbuch (Bern: Francke, 1958), under "Dreissigjahriger Krieg."

Only Gisela Herbst's more specific bibliography in Die Entwicklung des Grimmelshausenbildes in der wissenschaftlichen Literatur (Bonn: H. Bouvier, 1957), pp. 137-167, would lead one to Achim von Arnim's "Philander unter den streifenden Soldaten und Zigeunern im dreissigjahrigen Kriege."

3 Although the distinction is problematical and open to question, the term "historical literature" shall throughout be used to to refer to "fictional" works (Dichtung) and not to the writings of professional historians.

4 Thomas Langan, "The Future of Phenomenology," Phenomenology in Perspective, ed. F.J. Smith (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970), p. 12.

5 The pluralism of methods which might have been considered a crisis is now being taken as a positive element in literary criticism, for it permits a better fitting of method to the aspect of the text in question. After examining different facets of the text and the relevant methods, P.M. Wetherill concludes in The Literary Text: An Examination of Critical Methods (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974), p. 166: "The emphasis on sound, vocabulary, structure, sequence will vary from one work to another, but we need to possess as much objective information as possible if we are in any way to control our response to something as subjective in its appeal as a literary text."

6 Arthur C. Danto, "Historical Language and Historical Reality," Review of Metaphysics, 27 (1973), 232, argues that, "The distinction between history and fiction is inscrutable from the

perspective of logical form, much in the way which there is no determining from the descriptions of a set of possible but not compossible worlds, which, if any of them, is satisfied by the actual world. One could not tell by reading alone that the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire was not fabricated by Gibbon's creative imagination, and that the saga of the Hobbits was not simply a well-written chronicle of real events. The Emperor Caracalla is not especially more credible than Aragorn the King."

Danto is one of the leading but by no means the only philosopher concerned with the analytical philosophy of history, which has become extensive. Three introductions from different orientations are Peter Munz, "The Skeleton and the Mollusc: Reflections on the Nature of Historical Narratives," New Zealand Journal of History, 1 (1967), 107-123; Golo Mann, "Geschichtsschreibung als Literatur," originally in the Jahrbuch der Deutschen Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung (Darmstadt, 1964), pp. 103-124, then rept. in Methodenfragen der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, eds. Reinhold Grimm and Jost Hermand (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), pp. 428-449; and Wolf-Dieter Stempel, "Erzählung, Beschreibung und der Historische Diskurs," Geschichte--Ereignis und Erzählung, eds. Reinhart Koselleck and Wolf-Dieter Stempel (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1973), pp. 325-346.

Worth quoting are Hayden White's remarks on the similarity between the historians' tasks and those of the fiction writers, Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe (Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), pp. 6-7: "It is sometimes said that the aim of the historian is to explain the past by 'finding,' 'identifying,' or 'uncovering' the 'stories' that lie buried in the chronicles; and that the difference between 'history' and 'fiction' resides in the fact that the historian 'finds' his stories whereas the writer 'invents' his. This conception of the historian's task, however, obscures the extent to which 'invention' also plays a part in the historian's operations. The same event can serve as a different kind of element of many different historical stories, depending on the role it is assigned in a specific motific characterization of the set to which it belongs. The death of the king may be a beginning, an ending, or simply a transition event in three different stories . . . . The historian arranges the events in the chronicle into a hierarchy of significance by assigning events different functions as story elements in such a way as to disclose the formal coherence of a whole set of events considred as a comprehensible process with a discernible beginning, middle, and end."

7 The Plays of Grillparzer (London: Pergamon Press, 1969), pp. 109-110. Similar in approach to Wells is Keith A. Dickson, "History, Drama and Brecht's Chronicle of the Thirty Years' War," Forum for Modern Language Studies, 6 (1970), 255-273. Dickson notes that "It has always been a vexed question how far a creative writer, and in particular a dramatist, should respect the authentically documented hard facts of history, whatever liber-

ties he may take with the private psychology of the characters." (p. 255) without questioning the validity of the assumption implicit in the metaphor of "hard facts."

8 In a footnote in ibid., p. 112, Wells notes that Grillparzer may very well not have read Ranke. This may not be a shortcoming if one considers that Ranke's attitude to history was hardly value free. At one point, he wrote that, "God dwells, lives, is recognized in all history. Every act testifies of him, every moment preaches his name, but most of all, it seems to me, the context of history. No matter how it goes, let us try to reveal for our part the sacred hieroglyphics." Quoted in Theodore H. von Laue, Leopold Ranke. The Formative Years (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), p. 42. On the care with which Grillparzer did his research in primary sources, see Otto Dornberg, "Grillparzer's Use of Historical Sources in König Ottokars Glück und Ende," Colloquia Germanica, 2 (1972), 65–78.

9 My debt to phenomenological methods will, hopefully, be apparent here. The reader unacquainted with the Thirty Years' War may refer to the skeletal outline of dates and events in the Appendix.

10 Geschichte der deutschen Literatur (Konstanz: Carl Hirsch, ?1903), p. 273. Numerous other examples could be cited from histories of German literature down to George Schulz-Behrend in "German Literature to Goethe," German Language and Literature: Seven Essays, ed. Karl S. Weimar (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1974), p. 95: "Large armies of hired soldiers (Landsknechte) had to be maintained, or they would live off the land and loot and destroy. Peasant, burgher, and nobleman suffered enormous losses, and as the middle class was wiped out, absolutism gained . . . . Such modest achievements as literature and the arts could register under so much discouragement are a monument to human resilience. Small wonder that the literature of the Baroque period is a literature of extremes in spirituality and worldiness, resignation and abandon."

11 War Through the Ages (New York/ London: Harper and Brothers, 1946), p. 262.

12 ibid., p. 285.

13 Robert Ergang, The Myth of the all-destructive fury of the Thirty Years' War (Pocono Pines, Pennsylvania: The Craftsmen, 1956). S.H. Steinberg has reiterated his criticisms several times: "The Thirty Years' War: A New Interpretation," History, 32 (1947), 89-102; The 'Thirty Years' War' and the Conflict for European Hegemony 1600-1660 (London: Edward Arnold, 1966); and most recently in "Thirty Years' War," The New Encyclopedia

Britannica. Macropaedia (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1973), vol. XVIII, 333-344. For a survey of the conflicting views on the effects of the war, see Theodore K. Rabb, "The Effects of the Thirty Years' War on the German Economy," The Journal of Modern History, 34 (1962), 40-51.

14 Steinberg, The New Encyclopedia Britannica. Macropaedia, XVIII, 342.

15 ibid.

16 ibid., p. 343.

17 Ergang, The Myth of the all-destructive fury of the Thirty Years' War, pp. 4-7; and Steinberg, The 'Thirty Years' War' and the Conflict for European Hegemony, pp. 121-122. On the use of broadsheets as propaganda, see Goran Rystad, Kriegsnachrichten und Propaganda während des Dreissigjährigen Krieges. Die Schlacht bei Nördlingen in den gleichzeitigen, gedruckten Kriegsberichten (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1960), pp. 3-6; Elmer A. Beller, Propaganda in Germany during the Thirty Years' War (Princeton: Princeton University Press/ London: Humphrey Milford, 1940), pp. 3-16; and Renata V. Shaw, "Broadsides of the Thirty Years' War," Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress, 32 (1975), 2-24.

18 Thus, Rabb concludes in The Journal of Modern History, 34, p. 50 that ". . . despite recent renewed interest, the controversy still seems to have reached no satisfactory conclusion." See also H. Kamen, "The Economic and Social Consequences of the Thirty Years' War," Past and Present, 39 (April 1968), 44-61. Kamen takes the careful position that, "There can be no doubt at all that the war was a disaster for most of the German-speaking lands. The material devastation caused in Germany was enormous. Yet . . . the social consequences of this devastation differed only slightly from the consequences in areas rather outside the main track of the war." (p. 48)

19 Steinberg, The 'Thirty Years' War' and the Conflict for European Hegemony, pp. 116-120.

CHAPTER II

GRIMMELSHAUSEN'S DER ABENTHEUERLICHE SIMPLICISSIMUS

The one work that comes immediately to mind when mention is made of the Thirty Years' War in German literature is Hans Jacob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen's Der abentheuerliche Simplicissimus and the various continuations which supplement and complement it. Because the first five books appeared relatively soon after the conclusion of the war--in 1668--and because certain events in the novel were autobiographical and others historical, there has been a tendency to treat the novel itself as a historical document. This has given the interpretation of the work an interesting and somewhat ironical twist. Historians writing about the seventeenth century frequently referred to Simplicissimus as a work which reflects the situation of the times well, and indeed used it as a source.[1] Literary critics reading the same historical works for background information found, not surprisingly, that what the historians had said about the experience of living during the Thirty Years' War agreed well with Grimmelshausen's portrayal. This in turn encouraged the interpretation of the novel as "realistic." Typical of such interpretations is that of Hans Wagener, who has written in a recent survey of the German Baroque novel of Simplicissimus that:

> . . . one can go as far as saying that the present-day picture of the Thirty Years' War has been shaped by this novel. In it can be found descriptions of battles and sieges, of devastations of every kind, of looting soldiers who molest the farmers . . . . The novel is thus a mirror of the

> mores of its time and conveys to the modern-day reader the life of the people much more effectively than does any strictly historical account.[2]

This tendency to see the novel as "realistic" is in part an outgrowth of the Romantic conception of Simplicissimus as a fresh, immediate response by a contemporary to the Thirty Years' War. Thus, Eichendorff in his literary history praised the vividness and the freedom from literary convention which he found in Simplicissimus:

> Dieses Nomadenleben und die jugendliche Lust an Abenteuern, der bedeutende historische Hintergrund dieser Abenteuer mit einzelnen auftauchenden Helden und Narrengestalten, die einfache Treuherzigkeit der Auffassung und Darstellung, der verstandige Soldatenblick, der sich von keiner falschen Konvention irre machen lässt; das alles ist durchaus kerngesund.[3]

Unfortunately, on most counts the text does not substantiate Eichendorff's impressions. The significance of the historical background is not brought out in the book, the presentation is not simple, and although they might not be wrong, the literary conventions are definitely present in the work and in the treatment of war. What Eichendorff and subsequent critics seem to deny is the point that Grimmelshausen's treatment of the war is not the recording of personal immediate experience, and tells us very little about the Thirty Years' War as such.

The application of the label "realistic" to Simplicissimus is called into doubt by two factors. First, it is not easy to limit the range of meanings which "realism" as a literary term may incorporate.[4] Second, even if one understands "realistic" in an ordinary sense to mean an accurate reproduction of the world, it

would be difficult to use it in conjunction with the treatment of war in Simplicissimus. In order to deserve even this ordinary sense designation of "realistic," the portrayal of the Thirty Years' War here should do at least two things. It should present a precise picture of the practice of war, and it should allow us to see what is specific or unique to the Thirty Years' War in this picture. However, Grimmelshausen does neither. Instead, he employs stylized, almost archetypal images of war and its effects for didactic purposes. The historical Thirty Years' War is not Grimmelshausen's central concern.

One of the first telling challenges to the idea that Grimmelshausen anomalously broke free of the Baroque literary practices and conventions in his portrayal was delivered by Richard Alewyn through his discussion of Grimmelshausen's relation to "reality" (Wirklichkeit). In his study of Johann Beer, Alewyn had become sceptical about the relation of Baroque novelists to "reality":

> Bei Grimmelshausen wie bei Beer hat man den Eindruck eines starken Verhältnisses zur Wirklichkeit, und doch erweist sich bei näherem Zusehen die Art der Beziehung zur Wirklichkeit als eine völlig verschiedene, ja entgegengesetzte.[5]

In fact, Alewyn maintained there was precious little of reality in Simplicissimus: Grimmelshausen introduced just enough details to sketch in characters or to set the stage, but never enough to let the reader visualize either the people or the scene. Alewyn, basing himself on the research of Gustav Könnecke, also placed the autobiographical content of the novel into perspective. Grimmelshausen was not simply reporting on the war, and indeed could not be, since he himself saw little of it:

> Sein Thema sind Kriegsgeschichten aus seiner früh-
> esten Jugend, die dreissig Jahre zurücklagen und an
> denen er selbst nur einen äusserst bescheidenen An-
> teil genommen haben dürfte. Nicht gegenwärtige Er-
> fahrung, sondern träumende Erinnerung, nicht schlichte
> Beobachtung, sondern glühende Phantasie sind die
> Kräfte, die an seinem Werk geschaffen haben.[6]

Critics remain in disagreement on this question of the element of realism in Grimmelshausen, but there has been no effective refutation of Alewyn's contention yet.[7]

A further indication that this work is more than an unfiltered reproduction of the Thirty Years' War is the carefully structured complexity of Simplicissimus' role as a narrator.[8] Simplicissimus is not a simple picaresque hero, and he is not to be identified with Grimmelshausen. There are at least three different narrating voices: that of the naive, foolish Simplicissimus bumbling through the world, that of the experienced, reflecting and evaluating Simplicissimus recording the progression, and that of the didactic and cynical Grimmelshausen interjecting comments from time to time. By means of this triad of narrators, each with his own contributing voice, Grimmelshausen is able to achieve a subtle irony which is particularly effective in the handling of the war theme.

From the first references to the war, the flexibility of this complex of narrators is apparent. Simplicissimus, who is supposedly still a naive lad, couches the description of his family in military references with allusions to the classics:

> Die Rüst- oder Harnisch-Kammer war mit Pflügen/
> Kärsten/ Aexten/ Hauen/ Schaufeln/ Mist- und Heu-
> gabeln genugsam versehen/ mit welchen Waffen er
> sich täglich übet; dann hacken und reuthen war seine
> <u>disciplina militaris</u>, wie bey den alten Römern zu
> Friedens-Zeiten/ Ochsen anspannen/ war sein Haupt-

> mannschafftliches Commando, Mist aussführen/ sein Fortification-Wesen/ und Ackern sein Feldzug.9

Already the reflecting Simplicissimus has taken over the narrative role in order to make possible the subtly satirical description of farming in military terms. This same narrator makes the next double-edged reference to war, listing famous historical figures who were once shepherds. On one level, Simplicissimus appears merely to be defending himself against the charge that being a shepherd is a lowly occupation, but on the other he delivers a blow against the conduct of war:

> Das Hirten-Ampt sey ein Vorbereitung und Anfang zum Regiment; dann gleich wie die Bellicosa und Martialia Ingenia erstlich auff der Jagd geübt und angeführt werden/ also soll man auchdie jenige/ so zum Regiment gezogen sollen werden/ erstlich in dem lieblichen und freundlichen Hirten-Ampt anleiten. (p. 13)

It is hardly a statement to flatter soldiers, for it implies that those who serve in regiments are no different than sheep and that leadership of a regiment requires no greater talents than those of a herdboy. Neither is the other comparison, that of war to hunting, innocuous. The suggestion that hunting and war are similar in nature is one of the central themes in Simplicissimus, and will also occur in later works as a metaphor for war.

A less indirect reference to war comes in the folk-song which Simplicissimus is supposed to have learned from his mother. It contrasts the constructive, praiseworthy toil of the peasants with the destructive role of soldiers. Again, a note of irony creeps in. Though the soldiers undo the peasants' work, it might be argued, tongue in cheek, that the soldiers further moral ends by

encouraging the peasants to be humble:

> Ja der Soldaten böser Brauch/
> Dient gleichwol dir zum besten auch/
> Dass Hochmut dich nicht nehme ein/
> Sagt er: Dein Hab und Gut is mein. (p. 15)

The song is interrupted by the arrival of a troop of soldiers. Suddenly, the narrator with a classical learning is replaced by the ignorant and untutored Simplicissimus. Like the inexperienced Parzival, Simplicissimus is amazed at the sight of armed, mounted men and cannot comprehend what they are. He believes that the men on their horses together are one creature: "ich sahe anfänglich Ross und Mann . . . vor ein einzige Creatur an/ und vermeynte nicht anders/ als es müsten Wölffe seyn." (p. 16) Naively, he leads the soldiers home, whereupon the most horrible deeds are done to the peasants.

Of all the passages in the novel dealing with the war, this one shocks the reader most. Grimmelshausen borrowed freely from the stock of horror stories which had been recounted during the Thirty Years' War in various broadsheets and published in collections such as the Theatri Europaei.[10] There is little point in trying to make generalizations about brutality in the seventeenth century on the basis of this passage. It is not fair to Grimmelshausen to treat this aspect of the novel as a kind of lurid newspaper article, for then it is drawn out of context and its literary function within the work is lost. These scenes of violence have not been constructed haphazardly. Grimmelshausen has carefully intensified the effect by having the violence described by the naive Simplicissimus. The reader is upset that anyone could be so blind

and heartless as Simplicissimus. While his father is being tortured and his mother is being assaulted, he makes himself useful by turning the spit and watering the horses. This unreflecting participation in the enactment of violence characterizes Simplicissimus later in the book as well, and is therefore a portent of things to come. It is also important to notice that this scene of violence occurs close to the beginning of the book. In a few pages Grimmelshausen has built up an idyll and then destroyed it with exaggerated cruelties. Why? To shock the reader, surely, but not solely for the sake of the emotion. Grimmelshausen's attack on war does not end with or rest its case upon naturalistic depictions of the evils of war. By presenting this scene at the beginning, he is laying one of the cornerstones of the argument against war which does not develop fully until the later episode of the Huntsman of Soest.

Grimmelshausen uses Simplicissimus' naivity during the discussions with the hermit to further ridicule war. Simplicissimus describes the events at his home with an untutored matter-of-factness that strips them of their social meaning and reduces them to absurdity:

> Ha/ die eiserne Männer haben ihn angebunden/ da hat ihm unser alter Gaiss die Füss geleckt/ da hat mein Knan lachen müssen/ und hat denselben eisernen Mannen viel Weisspfennig geben/ grosse und kleine/ auch hübsche gelbe/ und sonst schöne klitzerechte Dinger/ und hübsche Schnür voll weisse Kügelein. (p. 27)

Seen merely for what they are, the money and the jewels which are the object of the crimes are reduced to pretty baubles, and the tortures are only curious modes of behaviour.

After the teachings of the hermit, Simplicissimus believes that he understands "alles/das jenige/ was ein Christ wissen soll" (p. 29), and appears to have grasped what war means. However, events shortly demonstrate, at least to the reader, that these assumptions are unfounded. Shortly after the hermit's death, Simplicissimus comes to a village which has been destroyed. It seems that he is ready to criticize war. Whereas the significance of the destruction of his home was lost on Simplicissimus, he now recognizes that the cause of the destruction must have been marauding soldiers:

> als ich hin kam/ fande ichs in voller Flamm stehen/ dann es eben ein Partey Reuter aussgeplündert/ angezündet/ theils Bauren nidergemacht/ viel verjagt/ und etliche gefangen hatten/ darunter der Pfarrer selbst war. (pp. 37-38)

Simplicissimus is quite distressed at the enthusiasm with which the opposing groups of peasants fight each other over what he cynically terms their own dunghill. He resolves to retreat from society and avoid men, living in isolation in the woods. However, there is no escaping the influence of the war. A group of soliders finds him in his hut and asks him to lead them out of the woods. Innocently he leads them to the nearest village and thus becomes the unwitting cause of yet more violence. If the naive Simplicissimus is aware of the meaning of war, he does nothing to show it, and indeed furthers the war through his actions.

In addition to the naive and experienced Simplicissimus narrators, the war is also presented with the intervention of Grimmelshausen himself into the narrative. This is especially noticeable in the account of the Battle of Wittstock. This account is carefully constructed, giving the impression of confusion and chaos

while at the same time permitting Grimmelshausen to slip in his ironical commentaries.[11] The battle begins in the best traditions of manuals of warfare, with both sides trying to gain an advantageous position and to capture the artillery. However, this neat strategic pattern quickly disintegrates to the grim fighting, where the only purpose is to kill others in order to avoid being killed: "Im Treffen selbst aber/ suchte ein jeder seinem Todt mit Nidermachung dess Nächsten/ der ihm aufstiess/ vorzukommen." (p. 177) From this curt line on the actual substance of the battle, Grimmelshausen goes on to stress that as an observer one would be able to see little except smoke and dust. A lengthy sentence is devoted to the part the horses play in the fight, a feature reminiscent of the traditional depictions of battles in the Germanic epics:

> die Pferd selbst hatten das Ansehen/ als wenn sie zu Verthedigung ihrer Herrn je länger je frischer würden/ so hitzig erzeigten sie sich in dieser Schuldigkeit/ welche sie zu leisten genötiget waren/ deren sahe man etliche unter ihren Herrn todt darnider fallen/ voller Wunden/ welche sie unverschuldter Weis zu Vergeltung ihrer getreueen Dienste empfangen hatten; andere fielen umb gleicher Ursach willen auff ihre Reuter/ und hatten also in ihrem Todt die Ehr/ dass sie von den jenigen getragen wurden/ welche sie in wahrendem Leben tragen müssen . . . . (p. 177)

That the horse is "carried" by its rider is a fitting symbol for the idea that in the senseless slaughter man has fallen in the natural order below the animals. Grimmelshausen's sympathies in this case are with the horses, who serve faithfully, but who have the good sense to flee when they can. In one sentence, Grimmelshausen surveys the carnage left by the battle:

> Die Erde/ deren Gewonheit ist/ die Todten zu be-

> decken/ war damals an selbigem Ort selbst mit Todten überstreut/ welche auff unterschiedliche Manier gezeichnet waren/ Köpff lagen dorten/ welche ihre natürliche Herren verloren hatten/ und hingegen Leiber/ die ihrer Kopff mangleten; etliche hatten grausam- und jämmerlicher Weis das Ingeweid herauss/ und andern war der Kopff zerschmettert / und das Hirn zerspritzt . . . . (p. 177)

Although the content of this sentence is gruesome, the effect upon the reader is muted by the rhetorical symmetry of the images. There is little anguish in this catalogue of the corpses. What the antithetical images do is negate whatever meaning this event might have had, and lead to the conclusion that the whole is a sad sight: "Summa Summarum, da war nichts anders als ein elender jämmerlicher Anblick." (p. 178) Despite its subject, this treatment of the battle is on the whole stylized and abstract. It can be applied to any battle whatsoever, for all will have the same structure: an original strategical intent, the actual fighting, and the dead on the ground afterwards. Also lacking is any indication of the battle's historical significance. We are told briefly who won, but not given any judgement on the role of this battle in the Thirty Years' War. This raises in turn the question of whether or not Simplicissimus can be said to be about the Thirty Years' War.

What strikes one about Grimmelshausen's treatment of the Thirty Years' War is that it would be virtually impossible to abstract any coherent chronology of the war from the novel. The uninformed reader seeking a coherent account of the events between 1618 and 1648 would be disappointed by the lack of sense or continuity or order. Even a familiarity with the general sequence of the war would not provide more than an underlying assurance that the Thir-

ty Years' War can be narrated in a more orderly fashion than here. Several later authors, especially Schiller, Döblin and Brecht, were able to present the Thirty Years' War as at least a forward-directed progression of events. Grimmelshausen does not convey this kind of a pattern, nor does he indicate the historical meaning of the events which he mentions. The example of the Battle of Wittstock has already been cited. Other battles, such as the reference to "the great battle of Nördlingen" could be given as instances where the historical context is lacking, and at none of the several places where the siege of Magdeburg is mentioned does Grimmelshausen explain that the destruction of the city was, and was regarded as, one of the major events of the war.

It might be argued that Grimmelshausen avoided providing larger and more comprehensive historical perspectives in order not to break the illusion of a fictive narrator. However, as has been indicated, he did not hesitate to intervene in other respects. It could not be argued that Grimmelshausen himself was bound by ignorance of the outcome to portray the Thirty Years' War as an open-ended series of more or less discrete events, since he was writing some two decades after the conclusion of the peace. That he chose to do so was consistent with his attitude that war was a senseless activity, and with the contemporary concepts of history. The early seventeenth century, by and large, did not concern itself with events for their own sake, since they could not determine man's ultimate fate. This had various consequences, of which two are relevant here. Historiography, when it went beyond recording chronology, was didactic, seeking in the event a specific instance of a general moral truth, or exegetical, seeking to interpret God's

design in events.[12] Grimmelshausen would therefore probably not have been overly disturbed by our complaint that he does not communicate the flow of the Thirty Years' War from start to finish. The relation of single events, such as the Battle of Nördlingen, to an end, the Peace of Westphalia or the fragmentation of the German states, or the shifting of social structures, apparently did not interest Grimmelshausen. In the novel, he presents the war as an ongoing affair, without real beginning or end, something which was part of the world when Simplicissimus entered it. The unity of the narrative is not forged from the subordination of events of the war to a directed pattern, but is rather linked in this case to the progression of the central figure, Simplicissimus, through the world. Thus, the Battle of Höchst has significance to the narrative because it is linked to the circumstances of Simplicissimus' birth, not for its contribution to the outcome of the Thirty Years' War.

If Grimmelshausen did not wish to present a history of the Thirty Years' War, and did not present his actual experiences of the war, then one might ask what the purpose of the pictures of war, especially of the brutal incidents at the beginning, serve. It is not enough to assume that the vignettes of brutality presented at the outset of the novel are intended, as they might be in a naturalistic work, to rouse the reader's revulsion against war, although they might do so. Neither would it be sufficient to see the war as mere background to the hero's picaresque wanderings, for there is good evidence that war was one of Grimmelshausen's concerns when writing Simplicissimus. In addition to the

fact that significant attention is devoted to it in the novel, an indication of the importance of the problem of war for Grimmelshausen may be found in the epilogue to his Satyrischer Pilgram, published two years before Simplicissimus in 1666. There he concluded a discussion on war by explaining that a good deal more might be said about it as a frightening and terrible monster than he had said in the preceding pages. He promised to expound further on the theme in Simplicissimus: "Mein Simplicissimus wird dem günstigen Leser mit einer andern und zwar lustigern Manier viel Particularitäten von ihm [vom Krieg] erzehelen/ indessen halte ich darvor es sey uns Christen nichts ohnanständiger als der Krieg/ den wir wieder einander führen . . . ."[13]

Perhaps because it is now taken for granted that war is something to be avoided and prevented if at all possible, it is not often explicitly pointed out that Grimmelshausen took a negative position towards war. For his contemporaries, the issue of whether or not wars ought to be accepted as part of normal human conduct was still open, as the tenth and final reflection of the Satyrischer Pilgram demonstrates. For the case that war is both necessary and justifiable, Grimmelshausen cited the classical authorities upon whom the doctrine of just war was based, including Aristotle, Xenophon, Plato and Hippodamus. Significantly, he omitted Christian authorities who were sometimes called upon to justify war. The reason becomes apparent in the rebuttal, for there, although he does not make specific reference to them, Grimmelshausen relied heavily upon the Christian critique of war, especially as formulated by Erasmus and other humanists of the

sixteenth century.[14] The basis of the Christian-Humanist attack on war was that it was a contravention of Christian teaching for men to kill each other, since all men had been made in the image of God, and Christ had given His life so that all men might live. Furthermore, war was unnatural and a perversion of the order which differentiated men from animals, since it reduced them in their actions to the level of beasts. In Grimmelshausen's words:

> Da verderben und richten einander zu Grund die jenige/ die Gott zu seinem Ebenbilde erschaffen! die! vor welche der HErr Christus gestorben/ damit sie lebten! da wird deren Blut vergossen/ und das Leben der jenigen wird abgethan/ für welche der HErr Christus/ damit er sie erhielte und behütete/ sein aigen Blueth nit gespart/ und sich selbst in den allerschmertzlichsten Todt gegeben; da muess einer einen andern umbbringen/ den er nie gesehen/ vielweniger von ihm belaidiget worden . . . .[15]

But if war was unnatural and not a part of God's design, then how could one explain that wars did exist? Clearly, war had to be an instrument of God's wrath, a punishment for sin, as all calamities were. As Grimmelshausen put it, war was one of the three great punishments of God: "eine von den dreyen und zwar die grösste Hauptstraffe Gottes."[16] The full panoply of rhetorical flourishes was employed by Grimmelshausen in listing the ill effects of war:

> Wo Krieg vorhanden/ werden erstlich alle gute Gesetz und Ordnung abgethan; die Städte eingenommen/ geplündert und zerstöret; der Landmann beraubet/ ermordt und verjagt; da ist iederman in Forcht/ Zittern/ Zagen und Klagen; alle guete und nutzbare Kunste und Handwercke liegen still/ die Alten werden gedrungen Hungers zu sterben/ und die Jungen mit in Krieg zu lauffen; die Jungfrauen werden genothzüchtiget/ und ehrliche Matronen geschändet; alle gute Gesetz schweigen; die Billigkeit hat ein Ende;

> die menschliche Hold- oder Freundseligkeit ist erloschen; die Religion befleckt/ die Gottesfurcht vergessen/ der Credit verlohren/ und in Summa/ da ist kein Haus das nit heule/ und kein Geschlecht das nicht weheklage . . . .[17]

Beneath the embellishments, one can detect the more or less standard catalogue of the Humanist attack on the consequences of war: morals are corrupted, people are killed, and property is destroyed. This however, is not an itemization of the actual destruction resulting from the Thirty Years' War, but a traditional rhetorical technique of the complaints against war.[18]

Grimmelshausen's opposition to the war was centred in the realization that the hope for gain through military triumph must remain illusory. What one side acquires, the other loses, so that every war negates its own meaning:

> Ist nicht des einen Sieg/ Triumph und Auffnaemmen/ des andern Schad/ Armuth und Verderben? Seind nicht des einen eroberte Schätze und Beuten des andern saurer Schweiss/ oder ist es nicht auffs wenigste das/ so ihm Gott bescheret? Ist nit des einen Theils Freud des andern Trauren?[19]

Bringing the reader to this awareness of the futility of war is one of the purposes of Grimmelshausen's portrayal of war in Der abentheuerliche Simplicissimus.

This purpose is achieved by showing the reader different aspects of war through the progression of Simplicissimus through the world. Two of the book's key passages on war, the scenes of violence at the beginning and the later account of the Huntsman of Soest, are one of the means whereby Grimmelshausen demonstrates the point that he made in the Satyrischer Pilgram, namely that war

is two-sided and self-contradictory.

Read in isolation, the chapters on the Huntsman's exploits would not lead one to conclude that Grimmelshausen was critical of much less strongly opposed to war. These episodes are frequently described as being in the tradition of the Schwank, the jest, in which the hero plays tricks and pranks on others. It is generally seen as the highpoint of Simplicissimus' good fortune, from which he will suddenly fall.[20] Indeed, Simplicissimus himself would have it seen as a period of triumph and fame:

> davon wurde ich in kurtzer Zeit bey Freunden und Feinden bekant/ und so berühmt/ dass beyde Theil viel von mir hielten/ allermassen mir die gefährliche Anschläg zu verrichten/ und zu solchem End gantze Parteyen zu commandieren anvertraut wurden . . . . (p. 187)

Simplicissimus is apparently a brave, clever and just captain, who has won the respect of his commanders and subordinates. The anecdotes about the reversed shoes and the hearing instrument reinforce the positive image of Simplicissimus, so much so that only with an effort does the reader recall that there is another side to the gallant and adventurous life of the soldiers. That is the view which was presented through the scenes of brutality at the beginning in the destruction of Simplicissimus' home. It is the view of the victims of war, the view which has been presented for most of the book. From the viewpoint of the peasants, there would be nothing amusing in Simplicissimus' account of clever cattle rustling techniques--for them this would be just another case of the soldiers' theft. Simplicissimus has changed sides in the struggle between the destructive soldiers and the peasants trying

to make a living, and in the process he has forgotten the meaning of that which the soldiers are doing. Although he had seen the suffering caused by war at first hand, he no longer thinks of it when he is preying on the countryside and never mentions one word about the things done by him and his men against the peasants.

Far from being a harmless jest or an amusing interlude, this series of escapades is the keystone of Grimmelshausen's argument against war. There can only be war if those waging it do not think about the consequences of their acts, do not place themselves in the position of the defeated. But there is a further satirical element to Grimmelshausen's argument, one with which he may devastate the inattentive reader. The reader who allows his vision to be distorted as he accompanies Simplicissimus through the world proves the point that it is all too easy to forget that which caused a shock of rejection, and to accept it when it appears in a different context. The transition from an acceptable set of opinions to totally untenable ones is deceptively gradual. Grimmelshausen demonstrates how effortlessly one may slip from the role of victim to that of oppressor, or from wisdom into folly. The individual's character need not undergo change: if his location and situation alter, his viewpoint will shift too, if there is no fixed centre.

From this point, the consistency of the treatment of the war with Grimmelshausen's depiction of other aspects of the world becomes apparent. As the prefatory poem to the Continuatio states, nothing in the world was certain, fixed, or permanent for the Baroque author.[21] Fortunes could reverse suddenly, as in fact

those of Simplicissimus do. The war which brought him fame and fortune also makes it impossible for him to retire to safety in comfort once he has lost his standing. In the attempt to show the reader the futility of trusting in the fortunate circumstances which war might temporarily create, Grimmelshausen touched upon one of the major themes in the treatment of the Thirty Years' War, namely the difference between the larger events and the individual experience of them. However, one cannot really say that Simplicissimus is about the Thirty Years' War in the way that Schiller's or Döblin's works are. The references to events such as battles or sieges are not made in order to communicate a picture of the Thirty Years' War and are not given meaning as events which contribute to the end of the war. War occurs in the book as an element of the world, albeit one which Grimmelshausen does not approve of and would have the reader reject. However, the same religious and philosophical framework which made Grimmelshausen's critique of war possible made an explanation of the Thirty Years' War as a historical event unnecessary. Only after the breakdown of that framework did it become essential for a writer to attempt to imbue the Thirty Years' War with historical meaning which could then be incorporated into a literary work.

Notes to Chapter II

1 For example, Carl J. Friedrich, The Age of the Baroque 1610-1660 (New York: Harper, 1952), p. 170.

2 The German Baroque Novel (New York: Twayne, 1973), p. 49.

3 Joseph Freiherr von Eichendorff, Werke und Schriften, eds. Gerhard Baumann and Siegfried Grosse (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta, 1958), IV, 695.

4 As Damian Grant has put the problem in Realism (London: Methuen, 1970), p. 2: "The word realism is in fact delinquent, and writers have indicated their mistrust of its behaviour either by sending it out under escort . . . or by letting it loose only when safely handcuffed by inverted commas." See also Richard Brinkmann, Wirklichkeit und Illusion (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1966); Harry Levin, "What is Realism?" Comparative Literature, 3 (1951), 193-199; James M. Ritchie, "The Ambivalence of 'Realism' in German Literature, 1830-1880," Orbis Litterarum, 15 (1960), 100-117; and René Wellek, "The Concept of Realism in Literary Scholarship," Neophilologus, 35 (1961), 1-20, to mention only a few of the many examinations of the term and its problems.

5 Richard Alewyn, "Realismus und Naturalismus," Deutsche Barockforschung, ed. R. Alewyn (Köln: Kiepenhauer und Witsch, 1965), p. 358. This contribution to the anthology was originally a part of Alewyn's Johann Beer. Studien zum Roman des 17. Jahrhunderts (Leipzig, 1932), pp. 196-215.

6 ibid., p. 367.

7 James M. Ritchie, "Grimmelshausen's Simplicissimus and the Runagate Courage," Knaves and Swindlers. Essays on the Picaresque Novel in Europe, ed. Christine J. Whitbourn (London: Oxford University Press for the University of Hull, 1974), pp. 52-54, takes issue with Alewyn.

8 My discussion is based upon but does not necessarily follow in all details that of Lothar Schmidt, "Das Ich im Simplicissimus," Wirkendes Wort, 10 (1960), 215-220.

9 Hans Jacob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen, Der Abentheuerliche Simplicissimus Teutsch und Continuatio des abentheuerlichen Simplicissimi, ed. Rolf Tarot (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1967), pp. 10-11. Subsequent references to the text from this edition shall be given in parentheses.

[10] Günther Weydt, Nachahmung und Schöpfung im Barock. Studien um Grimmelshausen (Bern: Francke, 1968), p. 454.

[11] This discussion is again indebted to Alewyn, "Realismus und Naturalismus," pp. 361-363.

[12] For a brief introduction to the seventeenth century concept and literary use of history, see Wilhelm Vosskamp, Zeit- und Geschichtsauffassung im 17. Jahrhundert bei Gryphius und Lohenstein (Bonn: H. Bouvier, 1967), especially pp. 9-62.

[13] Hans Jacob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen, Satyrischer Pilgram, ed. Wolfgang Bender (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1970), p. 160.

[14] See Robert P. Adams, The Better Part of Valor. More, Erasmus, Colet and Vives on Humanism, War, and Peace, 1496-1535 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962). Interesting information on classical explanations of the causes of war, which influenced the early Christian thinking on the subject, is provided by Arnaldo Momigliano, "Some Observations on Causes of War in Ancient Historiography," Studies in Historiography, A. Momigliano (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolosn, 1966), pp. 122-126. Erasmus, in The Complaint of Peace, trans. T. Paynell (London: Open Court, 1917), pp. 2-3, lamented: ". . . if war is so unhallowed that it becomes the deadliest bane of piety and religion; if there is nothing more calamitous to mortals and more detestable to heaven, I ask, how in the name of God, can I believe those beings to be rational creatures; how can I believe them to be otherwise than stark mad; who with such a waste of treasure, with so ardent a zeal, with so great an effort, with so many arts, so much anxiety, and so much danger, endeavour to . . . purchase endless misery and mischief at a price so high?"

[15] Grimmelshausen, Satyrischer Pilgram, p. 158.

[16] ibid., p. 159.

[17] ibid.

[18] Perhaps one might compare it with Vives' On Concord and Discord in Mankind (1529), quoted in Adams, The Better Part of Valor, p. 286: "We see fields destroyed and unpeopled, buildings razed, cities equally desert or wholly plundered and abandoned, food scarce and dear, scholarly work sluggish and almost abandoned, justice almost wholly corrupted, and evil received as though it were good."

[19] Grimmelshausen, Satyrischer Pilgram, p. 160.

[20] Clemens Heselhaus, in "Der abenteuerliche Simplicissimus," Der Deutsche Roman vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart. Struktur und Geschichte, ed. Benno von Wiese (Düsseldorf: August Bagel, 1963), I, 38, for example, sees nothing untoward in this lighthearted episode: "Die Taten des Jägers von Soest sind denn auch weniger Heldentaten als witzige Einfälle und Schwanke."

[21] Grimmelshausen, Simplicissimus, p. 467.

CHAPTER III

SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN

Whereas Grimmelshausen's Simplicissimus has been used as a source of historical information, few historians today would think of putting Schiller's trilogy of plays about the Thirty Years' War, Wallensteins Lager, Die Piccolomini, and Wallensteins Tod, in his bibliography. Even Schiller's study which he made in his capacity as a historian and not as a dramatist, Die Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Kriegs, is not considered a standard work on the Thirty Years' War. Today, Schiller's validity as a historian is quickly disclaimed: we know far more about the seventeenth century and about his sources on it than he did. Benno von Wiese feels that to try to rehabilitate Schiller as a historian would be "a lost labour of love, or even a wholly false approach."[1] It has even been claimed that historians have found the dramatical Wallenstein "closer to the truth" than Schiller's "factual" Wallenstein.[2] This kind of assertion may sound familiar, since it was encountered in the context of Grimmelshausen's reception and reputation. There, the main issue was the "realism" of the depiction of the war horrors; here, it is the degree to which Schiller's portrait of the enigmatic figure of Wallenstein is "accurate." Again, it might be possible to trace connections between the literary work and the historians that would lead them to consider the literary Wallenstein to be more "accurate" than Schiller's "factual" study. Virtually no one educated in Germany in the nineteenth century avoided reading and studying Schiller's dramas in

school.[3] It is therefore reasonable to expect that the similarities between Schiller's dramatical Wallenstein and the Wallenstein conceived of by some historians to be more than coincidental. However, the question of influence is always problematical, and the impact of Schiller upon the nineteenth century ought not to be overstressed. Perhaps what one could say is that the keynotes of the drama--the heroic image of Wallenstein and the liberal interpretation of history--found acceptance. Schiller was not alone at the turn of the nineteenth century in looking to the seventeenth century, and especially to the Thirty Years' War, and in increasing the stature of figures associated with the war.[4] Where Schiller's Wallenstein stood out as an achievement was in its combination of a relatively extensive knowledge of documented history with his theories of drama and history to produce a coherent artistic work.

In order to appreciate the importance of Schiller's contribution to the treatment of the Thirty Years' War and to the philosophy of history, it is necessary to review briefly certain developments which had transformed thinking about history since Grimmelshausen's day. Although it is an oversimplification, one can say that history had become secular: no longer was history eschatological in a Christian framework, unrolling according to foreordained plans. Instead, it had become the series of actions of mankind as described by man.[5] The immediate consequence was an awareness of the limitations upon individual ability to know, to comprehend, and to narrate the complexity of what was happening. In his treatise Auch eine Philosophie der Geschichte zur Bildung der Menschheit. Beytrag zu vielen Beyträgen des Jahrhunderts (1774),

whose very title conveys the concern of the age with the philosophy of history, Herder used the apt analogy of a painter who is too close to a huge canvas to be able to see the entire scape in order to describe the problem of the historian:

> Wenn du das Angesicht dicht an dem Bilde hältst, an diesem Spane schnitzelst, an jenem Farbenklümpchen klaubest: nie siehest du das ganze Bild--siehest nichts weniger als Bild! Und wenn dein Kopf von dieser Gruppe, in die du dich vernarrt hast, voll ist, kann dein Blick wohl ein Ganzes so abwechselnder Zeitläufte umfassen? ordnen? sanft verfolgen? bei jeder Scene nur Hauptwürkung absondern? . . . Kannst du aber nichts von alle dem: die Geschichte flimmert und fackelt dir vor den Augen! ein Gewirre von Scenen, Völkern, Zeitläuften . . . .[6]

Only God could perceive the essential unity of the multiplicity of events. Kant's thinking on history took a similar direction, but he also opened a way for overcoming the obstacle which seemed to make historical narrative or the comprehension of the historical process impossible. He felt that the "philosophical mind" would be able to discern some pattern in history. That pattern would be the progress toward freedom: "Die Geschichte . . . lässt dennoch von sich hoffen, dass wenn sie das Spiel der Freiheit des menschlichen Willen im Grossen betrachtet, sie einen regelmässigen Gang desselben entdecken könne."[7] Schiller, influenced by both Herder and Kant, also recognized the problem of history noted by the former, and accepted the solution advocated by the latter.[8]

Schiller's remarks on the philosophy of history stress that the historian's task was to make explicit the pattern in events, namely the development toward freedom. This desire to find a pattern led him into some difficulties. As a historian, he had

to find that some events, like the French Revolution, are much more easily integrated into this framework than other events, such as the Thirty Years' War. For Schiller as a dramatist, the difficulty was compounded when he was concerned with historical dramas. They would have to reveal the historical pattern and conform to the structure of a drama. It is to be expected, then, that the decision to write a play about Wallenstein should have resulted in much anguish for Schiller, as the letters which he wrote during the planning and actual writing prove. It was a long struggle. From the first mention of the possibility of such a play until its publication, nine years elapsed (1791 to 1800), not including the preceding years of historical research. This research in the documents had brought Schiller the realization of how many data there were, and how difficult it would be to bring them into some order. He wrote to Goethe on November 13, 1796: "Je mehr ich meine Ideen über die Form des Stücks rektifiziere, desto ungeheurer erscheint mir die Masse, die zu beherrschen ist, und wahrlich, ohne einen gewissen kühnen Glauben an mich selbst würde ich schwerlich fortfahren können."[9] To Körner he repeated the complaint that there was too much material: "An dem Wallenstein wird fortgearbeitet, es geht aber dennoch langsam, denn des Stoffes ist gar zu viel."[10] However, he added, he was determined to make the work into a unified whole: "Es soll ein Ganzes werden, dafür stehe ich Dir, und leben soll es auch in seinen einzelnen Teilen."[11] This determination was rewarded. On October 2, 1797, he could inform Goethe that he was satisfied with the play's "poetical organization." The remarks which accompany this declaration hint

at how he had succeeded in organizing the subject matter:

> Das Ganze ist poetisch organisiert, und ich darf wohl sagen, der Stoff ist in eine rein tragische Fabel verwandelt. Der Moment der Handlung ist so prägnant, dass alles, was zur Vollständigkeit derselben gehört, natürlich, ja in gewissem Sinn notwendig darin liegt, daraus hervorgeht . . . . Zugleich gelang es mir, die Handlung gleich vom Anfang in eine solche Präzipitation und Neigung zu bringen, dass sie in stetiger und beschleunigter Bewegung zu ihrem Ende eilt.[12]

Schiller had managed to bring history and the tragic drama into congruence by making the historical event, Wallenstein's negotiations with the Swedes, the central conflict of the drama. Everything in the drama could be subsumed under this structure. The implications of this reduction for the depiction and treatment of the Thirty Years' War need to be stressed, as they are often taken for granted. Schiller has not only transformed the biography of Wallenstein into a plot for a tragedy. He has also focussed the Thirty Years' War on the fate of Wallenstein, that is, on his tragic end. As the Prologue and the various items of historical background information in the drama make clear, the most crucial event in the life of Wallenstein has become a key event in the Thirty Years' War as well. To say that Schiller has "reduced" the Thirty Years' War is not intended to disparage his accomplishment. Few other works in the genre have the sweep and the wealth of detail that this historical drama has. The two problems that shall be of chief concern here are, firstly, how Schiller presents the conduct of war and, secondly, how Wallenstein functions as the pivotal point around which the war gravitates.

The bulk of the information on the contemporary practice of

war comes in Wallensteins Lager. However, the Prologue prepares the audience by sketching for it the background of devastation which the armies have wrought. Schiller's list of the effects of the war is similar in content to Grimmelshausen's catalogue in the Satyrischer Pilgram:

> Ein Tummelplatz von Waffen ist das Reich,
> Verödet sind die Städte, Magdeburg
> Ist Schutt, Gewerb und Kunstfleiss liegen nieder,
> Der Bürger gilt nichts mehr, der Krieger alles,
> Straflose Frechheit spricht den Sitten Hohn,
> Und rohe Horden lagern sich, verwildert
> Im langen Krieg, auf dem verheerten Boden.[13]

The long war has not only levelled cities--Magdeburg had become the catchword for such destruction--but also weakened morality and virtues. Again, one has the impression that this listing is rather abstract and conventional, providing few concrete details on the effects of the war.

The war's effects are also one of the several strands which run through the camp scene. The antipathy of the peasants to the soldiers is embodied in the figure of the peasant and his son who have come to the camp in order to win something through cheating at dice. The father justifies himself by claiming that everything the soldiers have was originally stolen from the people anyway:

> Nehmen sie uns das Unsre in Scheffeln,
> Müssen wirs wieder bekommen in Löffeln;
> Schlagen sie grob mit dem Schwerte drein,
> So sind wir pfiffig und treibens fein. (WL, i, 19-23)

The eight long months of quartering troops have impoverished the populace:

> Schon acht Monate legt sich der Schwarm
> Uns in die Betten und in die Ställe,
> Weit herum ist in der ganzen Aue
> Keine Feder mehr, keine Klaue,
> Dass wir für Hunger und Elend schier
> Nagen müssen die eignen Knochen. (WL, i, 25-30)

The technique of this passage is exemplary for the whole drama. With synecdoche--bed and stall, feather and claw--Schiller alludes to an activity and its consequences without having to describe it precisely. The practice of war is epitomized in these references, while hyperbole--gnawing our own bones--stresses the effects of the war. The combination of these two rhetorical devices reinforces the impression that the detail being focussed upon, the immediate confines of the stage, are only a small segment of ongoing events, and that the repercussions of what is shown on the stage will extend far beyond the bounds of the stage.

The same destruction which angers the farmer is a source of pride to the soldiers. Schiller portrays the soldier's viewpoint as Grimmelshausen did, through the analogy of war as a hunt. The comparison is readily at hand, for one regiment of troops is known as "Jäger," or rangers. One of these rangers boasts that throughout the land they are known as Wallenstein's "wild hunters":

> Ziehen frech durch Feindes und Freundes Lande,
> Querfeldein durch die Saat, durch das gelbe Korn--
> Sie kennen das Holkische Jägerhorn! (WL, vi, 216-217)

When writing these lines, Schiller may well have been thinking of the German states in the eighteenth century as well as the seventeenth. The prerogative of the nobility to hunt at will upon the land, destroying crops in the pursuit of game, was one of the per-

ennial causes for complaint, and was especially the target of Sturm und Drang protests.[14] Again, the effects of the soldiers going through the countryside are presented in a combination of under- and over-statement. The war is sudden, swift, and omnipotent, sweeping everything in its path away:

> In einem Augenblick fern und nah,
> Schnell wie die Sündflut, so sind wir da--
> Wie die Feuerflamme bei dunkler Nacht
> In die Häuser fähret, wenn niemand wacht--
> Da hilft keine Gegenwehr, keine Flucht,
> Keine Ordnung gilt mehr und keine Zucht. (WL, vi, 218-223)

The use of the similes "flood" and "fire" for the war is noteworthy. It is a reminder that Schiller's treatment of war in the play is in the first instance that of a poet, not of an objective historian. Secondly, it anticipates the use by nineteenth century authors such as Annette von Droste-Hülshoff of figures of speech from nature when referring to war. This transposition of a human activity like war into the natural realm, where human will would seem to be ineffectual, reinforces the idea that the individual is powerless in a situation of war. Schiller does not compose his picture of the effects of the war with details: he generalizes and then hints at the fact that for generations afterwards stories will be told of the havoc done. In reference to these lines of the ranger, Henry B. Garland has said:

> . . . not only is the language functionally concerned with the matter in hand; it goes even further, deliberately neglecting opportunities where the vocabulary of violence would be relevant. A disciplined, if slightly stylized, realism has gained the day . . . .[15]

While one can agree that Schiller has eschewed the "vocabulary of violence," it is difficult to understand wherein the "realism" might be found. Certainly Schiller has not tried to make the portrayal of the war specific to the Thirty Years' War. One could just as easily put the ranger's speech backward or forward in time to any number of historical situations without significantly distorting its meaning. The sprinkling of proper names--Friedland, Holk, Bayreuth, the Voigtland, Westphalia--are all that connect this picture of war to one time and to one locale. Taken in isolation, single sentences such as "Der Krieg hat kein Erbarmen" have the generalized quality of aphorisms, not the character of "realistic" observations on the Thirty Years' War. Schiller's distance from a "realistic" picture of the war is to be seen in the monk's speech in the eighth scene.

This speech seems to have been attempt by Schiller to recreate the tone of the attacks upon the Thirty Years' War made by those contemporaries like Grimmelshausen and Gryphius who experienced it. The source for this speech we know to have been Abraham a Santa Clara's Auff, auff ihr Christen, and at least one of the word-plays, that of "Rheinstrom-Peinstrom" is taken directly from there.[16] The monk's arguments against war bear a close resemblance to those made by Grimmelshausen as well. Although Schiller relied so heavily on seventeenth century models, this attempt of Schiller's to recreate the Baroque worldview is unsatisfying because it is inconsistent with the rest of the drama. There, Schiller writes as someone who is living in the eighteenth century and knows of the intervening years. Here, he has tried to pretend that he is living

in the time of the Thirty Years' War. The illusion is not successful because of the discrepancy.

Rather more convincing, although still of necessity simplified and typified in order to make them dramatically manageable are Schiller's portrayals of camp life and of the soldier's existence. Thus, the presentation of the motives which lead soldiers to join the army seems credible because Schiller is not content with giving one reason, but indicates instead that the reasons are various and complex. The major factor seems to be the desire for personal gain. This may take different forms. At its simplest level, it consists of the food and drink which the army provides. As the Wachtmeister observes, the possibility of a meal attracts troops and ties them more closely to the army:

> Die Truppen, die aus fremden Landen
> Sich hier vor Pilsen zusammen fanden,
> Die sollen wir gleich an uns locken
> Mit gutem Schluck und guten Brocken,
> Damit sie sich gleich zufrieden finden,
> Und fester sich mit uns verbinden. (WL, ii, 59-64)

The possibility of sharing in loot is another attraction, and one of the main activities at the camp is the exchange of various stolen items. The informal commerce brings civilians to the camp who expect to share indirectly the spoils of war. The farmer is one such, and the Marketenderin, who has followed the army throughout Europe, is another. Here this woman, who supplies the soldiers with various goods, is only one of the minor figures, but Brecht, who saw war as essentially a commercial enterprise, was to make her the central figure of his play Mutter Courage.

Some of the men have become soldiers in the quest for adven-

ture, excitement and freedom. The first Jäger has left the confines of school and his trade in order to seek novelty:

> Flott will ich leben und müssig gehn,
> Alle Tage was Neues sehn,
> Mich dem Augenblick frisch vertrauen,
> Nicht zurück, auch nicht vorwärts schauen.
> (WL, vi, 242-245)

He appreciates the carefree living for the moment, but also expresses an interest in winning honour through fighting, and resents the discipline imposed upon the standing army. Schiller implies that war is attractive to some men simply because it is an alternative to boredom. This is emphasized further by the jubilant tone of the recruit's song:

> Mutig geschwenkt,
> Schwert an der Seite,
> Frisch in die Weite,
> Flüchtig und flink . . . . (WL, vii, 389-392)

The warnings of the citizen that the recruit will eventually rue joining the army are ignored in this outburst of naive enthusiasm.

The hope for personal advancement through the war is a powerful incentive. Even an experienced soldier like the Wachtmeister cannot avoid a wistful note of envy when recounting the rapid rise of Buttler, with whom he once served:

> wir standen als Gemeine
> Noch vor dreissig Jahren bei Köln am Rheine,
> Jetzt nennt man ihn Generalmajor.
> Das macht, er tät sich bass hervor,
> Tät die Welt mit seinem Kriegsruhm füllen,
> Doch meine Verdienste, die blieben im Stillen.
> (WL, viii, 442-447)

The significance of all these individual desires--for wealth, excite-

ment, freedom, honour, and advancement--lies in the fact that together they constitute one of the forces that Wallenstein as general cannot overlook. If he does not provide an opportunity for the soldiers to gratify such desires by making war, then the soldiers will not remain with the army. Also, the same motives that move the soldiers in the lower ranks appear again among the generals and the commanders at the higher levels. Wallenstein has to somehow respond to the demands which are implicit in his lieutenants' acceptance of his leadership, and is himself not without ambition.

Notably lacking as a motive for the soldiers is religious faith. The first Jäger started under Gustavus Adolphus, where he found the emphasis on religion distasteful. Without any qualms of conscience, he decided to leave the Protestant side and to go over to the Catholics, where the atmosphere in the camp was much more to his liking:

> Alles da lustiger, loser ging,
> Soff und Spiel und Mädels die Menge!
> Wahrhaftig, der Spass war nicht gering,
> Denn der Tilly verstand sich aufs Kommandieren.
> (WL, vi, 271-274)

This shift from one side to the other foreshadows the later decision of Wallenstein to desert the Emperor. The lack of the soldiers' respect for the clergy is further demonstrated in their sarcastic reaction to the monk's speech.

Disrespect for religion is accompanied by a deterioration of the morals in the camp. This is shown in various ways. First, the incident with the farmer who is willing to cheat the soldiers shows that the war has blurred the distinction between right and wrong.

The peasant's son, who has not yet been corrupted by the war, tries to dissuade him from the dishonest effort. The rough and ready justice meted out to him is a further sign that the war has dissolved the codes of law and ethics. The "trial" is a parody of justice, based on the superior might of the soldiers. The peasant is acquitted not because he is innocent, but because to punish him would be to demean the soldier's honour. The war has also affected sexual mores. The Marketenderin has been deserted and left with an illegitimate child, but no one is too concerned about the moral questions involved in the matter. The first Jäger regards women as objects for pleasure, and would never dream of consenting to marriage. There can be no morality, or even pretense of morality under the conditions of war, or so Schiller would seem to be implying.

Counterbalancing the free and easy lifestyle and the chance for personal gain enjoyed by the soldiers is an element of anxiety. The soldiers' conversations are permeated with a feeling of insecurity, of doubt, and of specualtion about what will happen. They are participants in the war without access to the knowledge of any pattern or plan about its future course. The soliders are the pawns of war, not its masters. The war is a "broom" which sweeps them about as aimlessly as they have swept through the countryside:

> Heute da, Herr Vetter, und morgen dort--
> Wie einen der rauhe Kriegesbesen
> Fegt und schüttelt von Ort zu Ort,
> Bin indes weit herum gewesen. (WL, v, 134-137)

The freedom of movement that some have sought in joining the army is hollow, for it means that no security is possible for them:

> Ohne Heimat muss der Soldat

Auf dem Erdboden flüchtig schwärmen,
Dar sich an eignem Herd nicht wärmen . . . .
(WL, xi, 922-924)

Denied access to the permanence of dwelling as peasants, or in the towns, the soldiers try to master the flux of events around them by interpreting the intentions of their commanders. Small signs are evaluated for their possible meaning. The arrival of troops, of an emissary from Vienna, or of Wallenstein's subordinates, indicate that something is about to happen. What will occur is not apparent to the soldiers, though. They believe, however, that Wallenstein has made sure plans, and they trust in his judgement. The irony is that Wallenstein is just as uncertain about the future as the soldiers. Schiller presents Wallenstein's uncertainty, in which the soldiers place their trust and upon which their lives depend, rather uncritically. Alfred Döblin will take this very dichotomy between the trust in the governing authority and its inability to direct events as one of the targets of his treatment of the Thirty Years' War.

After dominating the stage in Wallensteins Lager, the army remains in the wings in Die Piccolomini and Wallensteins Tod, but its influence is always felt. Wallenstein must act if he does not wish to lose the support of his troops, but at the same time he is restricted in what he can do by the physical limits of logistics. This side of the conduct of war is not the concern of the ordinary soldier and does not dominate as a theme in Wallensteins Lager. The generals must worry about such matters as moving and supplying troops, though. The opening words of Die Piccolomini are those of Illo and Isolani talking about such matters: the length of the

march and the capture of supply trains. Gradually, the reader learns other details of campaigning in the seventeenth century. Two necessary preconditions for making war then were good weather and sufficient funds to pay the soldiers, as Wallenstein sharply reminds the Emperor's emissary, Questenberg:

> Das Heer war zum Erbarmen, jede Notdurft, jede
> Bequemlichkeit gebrach--der Winter kam.
> Was denkt die Majestät von ihren Truppen?
> Sind wir nicht Menschen? Nicht der Kält und Nässe,
> Nicht jeder Notdurft sterblich unterworfen?
> (DP, II, vii, 1136-1140)

Success in war results from a combination of favourable circumstances: sufficient money and enough supplies to keep enough men in the field to be able to overwhelm the enemy. Because he has an overview of all these various circumstances, Wallenstein is the pivotal point of the army. His centrality is crucial for his control of power.

As Stephen Spender has pointed out, one of Schiller's major concerns was always the theme of power.[17] In the case of Wallenstein, this problem of power is formulated in terms of command and obedience. Without acceptance of his decisions by the army, Wallenstein can do nothing. He cannot compel the troops to do anything if they will not obey. The camp scenes have demonstrated that the army is not passive: the soldiers' loyalty depends upon the degree to which their individual desires are fulfilled or likely to be fulfilled. When the point does come where the army refuses to obey Wallenstein, there is no force available to him which he can apply in order to reassert his power. Few things show the desperation of the powerless general better than Wallenstein's

strange order to Terzky to train guns on the troops and to instruct them to await further commands:

> Sie sollen sich zurückziehehn, augenblicks,
> Ist mein Befehl, und in der Ordnung schweigend warten,
> Was mir gefallen wird zu tun.
> (WT, III, xix, 2203-2205)

The key word, put into italics by Schiller, is silently: if Wallenstein is to reassert his control, the army must surrender its right to speak; orders and not discussions are the basis of the relationship of an army to its general. Schiller has preceived the close link between control of channels of communication and power. The chain of orders in the army must be basically a unidirectional flow of information, implicitly accepted, if Wallenstein is to have the power of command. Similarly, political power is linked to a control of communication. This rather abstract idea is given concrete expression by Schiller's treatment of the role that documents have in events.

This aspect of Schiller's portrayal of historical events and of the Thirty Years' War does not seem to have received the attention it might deserve. It is after all not clear that documents were any more vital or played a greater determining role in the workings of armies and governments in the seventeenth century than today. Although it would be difficult to prove, it does seem likely that Schiller is reflecting his own experience as a researcher when he portrays the importance of written documents for events. The historian who has access to the past primarily through documents can easily come to place a great emphasis on written material as not only a source on but as a part of past events. In

the absence of other remains of the functioning of governments, it is easy to overemphasize the role that protocols, letters, minutes and so forth did play in the events they record. Documents do play a key role at several junctures in Wallenstein. First, there is the communication of the Emperor brought to Wallenstein by Questenberg. The power of the Emperor appears only through the medium of documents, and one gains the impression that the Imperial strength resides in the bureaucratic network centred at Vienna. Then, there is the declaration of loyalty to Wallenstein which Illo tricks the generals into signing, one of the central incidents in the plot. The importance of written evidence appears to be so great that the dubious circumstances under which the signatures were obtained will not invalidate the paper's usefulness to Wallenstein. Third, there is the packet of letters containing details of Wallenstein's secret negotiations which falls into enemy hands. Fourth, there is the secret imperial order authorizing Octavio to arrest Wallenstein at the right moment. Then, there is the copy of the letter which Wallenstein is thought to have sent to the Emperor with which Octavio persuades Buttler to desert Wallenstein.[18] And finally, there is the unexpected letter from the Emperor which informs Octavio of his new title, a final gesture of the impact that documents can have. By showing that Wallenstein has no absolute control over the information network--his own letters can be intercepted, those from the court need not come to him--Schiller indicates that Wallenstein's hold upon power is mot nearly as firm as it might seem.

Paralleling Wallenstein's location at the centre of the army,

of the officers, and of the web of intrigue, is his location at a focal point of the historical process. In both cases, the centrality has two functions. Externally, for dramatic purposes, this centrality provides structural unity. Internally, within the confines of the play, the centrality contributes to or makes possible an illusion of power which is essential for Wallenstein's hubristic actions. Wallenstein's hold over the army is illusory, because ultimately he is not able to control the soldiers, despite his ostensible positon as their commander. Similarly, Wallenstein's belief that he can determine the course of history because the events of the Thirty Years' War seem to coincide with and culminate in his fate proves deceptive.

To the audience, Schiller conveys the idea that Wallenstein is at the centre of the historical process through the information on the background of the Thirty Years' War that he presents. Schiller did not rely on the assumption that the audience had prior knowledge of the events of the Thirty Years' War, and presented enough information within the play so that someone could write an outline of certain events in the Thirty Years' War, in chronological order. However, this outline would not encompass the entire Thirty Years' War by any means, although it might appear to do so, for the events which are mentioned have been selected for the part they play in explaining Wallenstein's situation. The plot of the play has been used by Schiller as a kind of filter, through which the mass of historical data have been passed. Only that information about the Thirty Years' War which is relevant to Wallenstein's story has been retained. To integrate this kind of information

into a play might have produced a dull work with a pedantic flavour, but Schiller skillfully wove it into the fabric of the whole. The audience is not overwhelmed with chunks of history all at once, but is gradually introduced to the background of the play.

Nowhere except in the Prologue does Schiller refer to the Thirty Years' War. It would of course be impossible for the participants to know how long the war will yet continue. The Prologue does not use the title "Thirty Years' War" either, although there is a reference to the "thirty years of war" and the peace which terminated them:

> Die alte feste Form, die einst vor hundert
> Und funfzig Jahren ein Willkommener Friede
> Europens Reichen gab, die teure Frucht
> Von dreissig jammervollen Kriegsjahren.
> (WL, Prolog, 71-74)

A quick survey of the Thirty Years' War is then provided in Wallensteins Lager when the Marketenderin relates where she has been with the army:

> Bin hinauf bis nach Temeswar
> Gekommen, mit den Bagagewagen,
> Als wir den Mansfelder täten jagen.
> Lag mit dem Friedländer vor Stralsund,
> Ging mir dorten die Wirtschaft zu Grund . . . .
> (WL, vi, 139-144)

The reference to the failure at Stralsund is taken up again much later in the meeting between Wallenstein and the Swedish representative Wrangel:

> Ein Wrangel wars, der vor Stralsund viel Böses
> Mir zugefügt, durch tapfre Gegenwehr
> Schuld war, dass mir die Seestadt widerstanden.
> (WT, I, v, 225-227)

In this second reference, one can see Schiller's method of presenting the history of the Thirty Years' War. An event, such as the siege of Stralsund, is introduced and given meaning as part of Wallenstein's career. Only secondarily is it given meaning within the context of the war. In the same way, the scene of Die Piccolomini in which Questenberg reviews the history of the war (II, vii) is focussed upon the person of Wallenstein. Essentially, Questenberg summarizes the history of the Thirty Years' War as the history of the Emperor's dealings with Wallenstein.

But not only the audience must think of the Thirty Years' War as centred upon Wallenstein: he himself must believe that he can decisively influence the course of events. We are given two indications of why he does so. First, Wallenstein's faith in astrology leads him to conceive of the historical process in terms of key moments. When the stars and the planets are in a specific configuration, then circumstances are uniquely suited for action:

> Jetzt muss
> Gehandelt werden, schleunig, eh die Glücks-
> Gestalt mir wieder wegflieht überm Haupt,
> Denn stets in Wandlung ist der Himmelsbogen.
> (WT, I, iii, 32-35)

His experience in the war has reinforced the conviction that there are moments in history which are more decisive than others. Such moments he interprets in personal terms. The failure to take Stralsund, which prevented him from gaining control of the Baltic, he sees as a personal disaster: "Den Admiralshut risst Ihr mir vom Haupt." (WT, I, v, 231) Similarly, the success of the Imperial cause when he was commander and its failure when he had been dis-

missed at Regensburg convinced him that there was a connection between his fate and that of the Empire. This has led him to the conclusion that his personal decision now, at the time of the drama, can have a decisive impact and that because his fate corresponds to the course of events, will be a correct decision. Unfortunately the error of this hubristic reasoning is demonstrated by his failure.

Wallenstein's ultimate inability to control events presents something of a paradox, or at least a contradiction. On the one hand, Schiller has written a drama about the Thirty Years' War which selects a "major" figure as its subject and relies upon that figure to provide dramatic structural unity. The implication is therefore strong that an individual such as Wallenstein is important in the historical process and that his decision can be a determining factor. But on the other hand, the play succeeds as a tragedy by showing that Wallenstein is unsuccessful and ultimately helpless in the face of events. The question then arises whether there is any point in selecting a "major" figure for the drama, for any character would serve as well to reveal the situation of powerlessness.

Considerations such as these lead us to the treatment of the Thirty Years' War in the nineteenth century, where relatively minor figures are indeed selected to show the helplessness of the individual when confronted by large events such as war.

Notes to Chapter III

1 "Schiller as Philosopher of History and as Historian," Schiller Bicentenary Lectures, ed. F. Norman (London: University of London Institute of Germanic Languages and Literature, 1960), p. 83.

2 Herbert G. Göpfert, "Anmerkungen," to Friedrich Schiller, Historische Schriften, Zweiter Teil: Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Kriegs (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1966), p. 365

3 See p. 387 of the "Einführungen" to Friedrich Schiller, Werke, eds. Hermann Schneider and Lieselotte Blumenthal (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1949).

4 On the Romantics' "rediscovery" of Grimmelshausen, for example, see Gisela Herbst, Die Entwicklung des Grimmelshausenbildes in der wissenschaftlichen Literatur (Bonn: H. Bouvier, 1957), pp. 57-68. Peter Paret notes in "The History of War," Historical Studies Today, eds. Felix Gilbert and Stephen R. Graubard (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), p. 373, that in 1805 Clausewitz, who was to become one of the major theoreticians of war, called for a new evaluation of the seventeenth century military, in order to bring out their "positive" achievements in the art of war. It would be an interesting task to examine whether this is coincidental, or whether there is a connection between the literary re-evaluation of the seventeenth century and that of Clausewitz and other Wissenschaftler, but one which goes beyond the bounds of this study.

5 See especially Carl L. Becker, The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932); and also C.A. Patrides, The Grand Design of God. The Literary Form of the Christian View of History (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).

6 Johann Gottfried Herder, Sämtliche Werke, ed. Bernhard Suphan (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1891), V, 504-505.

7 Quoted in Deric Regin, Freedom and Dignity. The Historical and Philosophical Thought of Schiller (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965), p. 56.

8 On Kant's philosophy of history, see Michael Despland, Kant on History and Religion (Montreal/ London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1973), pp. 17-100. On Schiller's relationship to Kant's thought, see Ronald D. Miller, Schiller and the Ideal of Freedom. A Study of Schiller's Philosophical Works with Chapters on Kant (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970).

[9] Quoted in Horst Hartmann, Wallenstein. Geschichte und Dichtung (Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1969), p. 141.

[10] ibid., p. 147.

[11] ibid.

[12] ibid., p. 154.

[13] Friedrich Schiller, Werke, eds. Hermann Schneider and Lieselotte Blumenthal (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1949), VIII, Wallensteins Lager, Prolog, lines 84-90. Subsequent references to lines from the text in this edition shall be given in parentheses after the quotation, with the following abbreviations: WL for Wallensteins Lager, DP for Die Piccolomini and WT for Wallensteins Tod.

[14] Perhaps the best-known example of the Sturm und Drang protest against the aristocratic prerogative to hunt is Gottfried August Bürger's poem "Der Bauer: An seinen Durchlauchtigen Tyrannen." Written in 1775, it angrily questions the nobility's right to destroy crops simply for the pleasure of hunting:

> Wer bist du, dass, durch Saat und Forst,
> Das Hurra deiner Jagd mich treibt,
> Entatmet, wie das Wild?--
>
> Die Saat, so deine Jagd zertritt,
> Was Ross, und Hund, und du verschlingst,
> Das Brot, du Fürst, ist mein.

Gedichte, ed. A. Sauer (Berlin: W. Spemann, ?1883), p. 65. The connection between hunting and war is also made in Goethe's Götz von Berlichingen, Act IV, where Lerse says: "Die Jagd ist doch immer was, und eine Art von Krieg." This line is followed by the announcement that war has actually broken out. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Werke, ed. Wolfgang Kayser (Hamburg: Christian Wegner, 1962), IV, 156.

[15] Schiller the Dramatic Writer. A Study of Style in the Plays (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), p. 143.

[16] See the "Anmerkungen," pp. 476-477, to the text of Wallenstein.

[17] In Stephen Spender, "Schiller, Shakespeare and the Theme of Power," A Schiller Symposium in Observance of the Bicentenary of Schiller's Birth, ed. A. Leslie Wilson (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960), pp. 51-64.

[18] See also William F. Mainland's discussion of this letter in Schiller and the Changing Past (London: William Heinemann, 1957), pp. 32-56.

CHAPTER IV

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The selection of Simplicissimus and of Wallenstein hardly needs to be justified at length, given the stature of both and the paucity of rival candidates for examination on this topic. With the nineteenth century, however, it is not nearly so easy to justify one's choice of works which deal with the Thirty Years' War. If there is one kind of writing in which the authors of the nineteenth century excelled both qualitatively and quantitatively, it is historical literature. All historical periods were treated in every possible genre, and were avidly read by apparently indefatigable readers. Hartmut Eggert estimates that in the years 1850 to 1875 alone, some eight hundred historical novels were produced.[1] The Thirty Years' War received its due share of attention as a historical period. Writers were interested in it not only because of the intrinsic fascination of war and the enigmatic characters such as Wallenstein, but also because one saw parallels between the confessional strife of the seventeenth century and the Austrian-Prussian rivalry in the nineteenth.[2] Probably the most popular of the works dealing with the Thirty Years' War, Gustav Freytag's Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit, consisted of essays on the border line between history and literature. They were solidly in the "destruction" school, and Freytag has been credited with doing much to keep the stories about the horrors of the Thirty Years' War alive.[3] In an effort to do the vastness of

of the Thirty Years' War as a theme justice, writers resorted to vast novels, such as Heinrich Laube's Der deutsche Krieg (published from 1863 to 1866 in three volumes) and Ricarda Huch's Der grosse Krieg in Deutschland (also in three volumes, published from 1912 to 1914). Interesting as they might be, these panoramic novels are not on the same level as other important historical literature of the century, and provide relatively meagre returns when analyzed for their contribution to the treatment of the Thirty Years' War. On the other hand, the four shorter works examined here, Annette von Droste-Hülshoff's ballad "Die Schlacht im Loener Bruch," Adalbert Stifter's Der Hochwald, Wilhelm Raabe's Else von der Tanne, and Conrad Ferdinand Meyer's Gustav Adolfs Page, display in fine how the problems of dealing with the Thirty Years' War were confronted in the nineteenth century. Two of them, Droste-Hülshoff's ballad and Raabe's novelle, have been described as masterpieces. In contrast, Meyer's novelle has not been acclaimed as one of his better works, a judgement that Meyer himself shared. Its inclusion here is not on the grounds of literary excellence, but rather as a representative example of one kind of treatment of the Thirty Years' War. Stifter's novelle has been well received, but the emphasis in critical studies of it has been placed on the treatment of nature rather than the Thirty Years' War, partly because it is not amenable to the comparison of the story to any historical documents.

Although there is no necessary reason to expect it to be so, the treatment of the Thirty Years' War by these four authors displays certain common features. In each case, the war is seen

as a force which breaks in upon an enclosed, controlled world, ruining the lives and plans of those it touches. It is difficult to generalize about reasons for such a similarity, and one can quickly become bogged down in the theoretical difficulties of the sociology of literature. One factor may be that none of the four actually participated in a war, although the nineteenth century was sufficiently turbulent. This might have made them hesitant about depicting war directly. However, their response to the Thirty Years' War would also seem to be consistent with other aspects of mid-nineteenth century bourgeois writing. For a long time, writers like Droste-Hülshoff, Stifter and even Raabe were considered as part of the "Biedermeier" period, whereby one meant that peace, safety and simple goodness pervaded their works. One tended to disparage this literature of calm, resignation and withdrawal as trivial and shortsighted. Not until after Paul Kluckhohn drew attention to it did people notice that the illusion of calm and quiet in both the lives of the authors and in their works is an achievement against despair and the omnipresent threat of chaos.[4] As M. J. Norst puts it: "If the world which they present as part of the cosmic order is so rational, so obedient to ethical laws, so free of dissension, it is because they feel a terrible need to defend ideals which are in danger."[5] This is surely apt for Droste-Hülshoff, Stifter, Raabe and Meyer. In the Thirty Years' War they saw one instance where the danger to ideals and order had been overwhelming, and it is the dissolution of order which they tried to portray.

Annette von Droste-Hülshoff's "Die Schlacht im Loener Bruch"

There would seem to be something incongruous about Annette von Droste-Hülshoff as the author of a historical ballad centred around a battle, replete with details of slaughter and death. With the exception of Döblin, none of the other writers working with the Thirty Years' War who have been examined in this study attempted to reproduce the shock of the war so immediately. One would not expect that a poetess whose principal realm of experience was a very constricted family and social life to find in the Thirty Years' War personally relevant material. The fact that the writer in this case was a woman has intensified the sense of bewilderment at this discrepancy. Two commentators, both female, have remarked on the "masculine tone" of the poem. Margaret Mare remarks: "If 'Die Schlacht im Loener Bruch' had been published anonymously, it would have been difficult to guess a woman's hand behind it."[6] Mary Lavater-Sloman thought: "Manches Männergedicht klingt weich und zahm gegen diese Wortschleuder . . . ."[7] Aside from the sexist overtones in such observations, they are wrong in their assumptions about Droste-Hülshoff and the nature of the battle description in the poem.

For the first, another woman critic, Joyce Hallamore, has reminded us that the image of Annette von Droste-Hülshoff as a quiet and reserved individual is valid only for the outer appearance. Inwardly, Droste-Hülshoff was riven and rent by psychological and existential problems:

> The private image, that of the poet, is an infinitely complex one, and the woman who walked the moor

> in solitary hours, escaping the trivia of social life, is revealed as a victim of tragic contradiction--unfulfilled desires and passions condemned by her conscience.[8]

Within this context, the apparent disparity falls away and reveals in its stead that the theme of war and confused battle might well be suited to Droste-Hülshoff's psychological make-up. Furthermore, recent critical work is beginning to find in Droste-Hülshoff a strong element of social criticism. While hardly engagée, she did look beyond her cloistered existence to what was happening around her.[9]

The ballad was written with what was for Droste-Hülshoff relative haste. On August 4, 1837, she wrote in a letter that the poem did not yet exist on paper, and by the beginning of February, 1838, it was finished.[10] Her inital intention was to focus on the figure of Christian of Brunswick, as a prose draft emphasized:

> Er [Christian] kann sich im Unglück nicht an andere schliessen, und das macht ihm den Eindruck, als ob er verlassen wäre; er fühlt jedoch sein Unrecht. Christian tut etwas, was andere sehr frappiert; er bleibt ruhig dabei. Er steht so einsam wie eine Eiche in der Heide; alles Getier und Vögel flüchtet unter seinen Schatten; dies gibt ihm ein scheinbares Leben, aber er ist allein.[11]

Perhaps drawing back from the possibility of being identified with this confused and isolated figure, she expanded the work to include the historical background and a depiction of the landscape which she loved. Perhaps she was also wary of producing what in effect would have been a paler imitation of Schiller's Wallenstein.

In the aftermath of Sir Walter Scott's success, it was virtually automatic for authors to prepare themselves for writing

historical literature by studying accessible source materials, and Droste-Hülshoff did so extensively, as her research notes reveal.[12] In order to be able to manage the copious facts that her historical research had accumulated, she was forced to restrict the action to a specific incident. She selected, as Schiller had done with Wallenstein, what she considered the single momentous incident in the life of Christian, his defeat in 1623 by Tilly. The poem is thus centred around the battle, with an extensive introductory background. Written in rhymed couplets, the ballad is divided into two major sections. The first of these sets the stage and includes most of the background information on the events of the war as well as on Christian's life. The second, which introduces Tilly and culminates in the description of the battle itself, is less intricate than the first section. Although it also begins in the narrator's present, it remains more consistently in the temporal vicinity of the battle than the first section, so that Tilly's character, for example, is shown through his appearance and actions, not through a biographical flashback. At the end, the poetess explicitly places the story into the distant past:

> Zweihundert Jahre sind dahin,
> Und alle, die der Sang umfasst,
> Sie gingen längst zur tiefen Rast.[13]

This conscious destruction of the historical illusion for the reader, revealing the poem as just a vision of history, has a didactic function, for thereby Droste-Hülshoff calls the very meaning of the battle and the war into doubt. The events occurred

so long ago that for the people they have lost all significance: if someone finds a skull while digging at the site, he believes that it marks the site of some heathen battle:

> Am Moore nur trifft wohl einmal
> Der Gräber noch auf rost'gen Stahl,
> Auf einen Schädel; und mit Graus
> Ihn seitwärts rollend, ruft er aus:
> "Ein Heidenknochen! Schau, hier schlug
> Der Türke sich im Loener Bruch!" (p. 814)

Nothing remains of the religious passions which might have moved the combatants, and the event is more or less deprived of any meaning that it might have had.

Although she does not side with either the Protestant or the Catholic cause, Droste-Hülshoff does concern herself with the problem of the Thirty Years' War as a religious war. She makes it clear that she believes that if the war was indeed a confessional struggle, then it could only be counterproductive in the long run, making all faith impossible. It was paradoxical that "um Lehren, liebereich,/ Gefochten ward den Wölfen gleich." (p. 746) In an episode that is disproportionately long, Droste-Hülshoff describes the desecration of a small village church by some soldiers. The reason for the length of this digression seems to be founded in Droste-Hülshoff's own religious faith and her conviction that religious belief was vital for society. This attack upon the symbols of faith is loaded with more of the narrator's personal distress than the loss of life in the subsequent battle:

> Ach, soll ich künden, wie entehrt
> Ward meines Glaubens teurer Herd!
> Wie man die Heiligtümer fand,

Und kirchenschänderische Hand
Mit Branntwein füllt bis oben an
Den Kelch, so fasste Christi Blut! (p. 762)

The reaction of the common people to the destruction of religious order is one of confusion and relapse into superstition. Thus the simple village woman cannot understand why Christian, who has been banned, and is supposed to be a heathen, does not have her killed:

O Jesus Christ!
Ihr Retter selbst der Herzog ist--
Und dieser liegt im Kirchenbann! (p. 767)

Not only the peasants have trouble orienting themselves in a time of religious disorder, though. All values have been called into doubt.

By analyzing the motives of the leading participants in the battle, Droste-Hülshoff does not deny the importance of the influence of religious motives, but shows that it could not be considered apart from the complexities of personal psychology. She places special emphasis on the compulsion of what one might call drives or passions. Christian may be motivated by religion or politics, but in Droste's view he is just as much compelled by a desire for personal honour and by innate forces which he can discipline but not comprehend. This is given concrete expression by describing Christian in animal and nature metaphors. He is a "tiger," and a "meteor," and his being is composed of contradictory elements of "Frost und Brand,/ Heilkräftig Gold, Oxydes Gift." (p. 755) His actions reflect this inner self-contradiction. The martinet who has two men executed for a breach of discipline is

nevertheless also concerned for the well-being of the villagers. He has a conscience which functions despite the exigencies of war, and will not let himself hear the priest's depiction of the peasants' suffering.

Equally complex is Tilly, whose "bloody hand" has devastated the countryside:

> O Tilly, deine blut'ge Hand
> Hat guter Sache Schmach gespendet!
> Wohin dein buschig Aug sich wendet,
> Ein Kirchhof wird das weite Land. (p. 747)

However, this destruction has been carried on behalf of his faith, an ostensibly worthwhile cause. Like Christian, Tilly's outward calm hides a struggle with inner emotions:

> Der Feldherr steht und streicht den Bart;
> Das war nun einmal seine Art,
> Gekannt von allen, keinem gut;
> Gewaltsam aufgeregtes Blut
> So will er dämpfen . . . . (p. 778)

Tilly too is an embodiment of elemental forces: he is described as having a shark-like quality, cold and grey. The inner confusion of the two commanders extends to their officers. Tilly's captains feel that they are not sure which attitude to take to the war and to the enemy. Some respect Christian as a worthy military foe, but others deplore the fact that the conflict has become a civil war:

> Wer so die menschliche Natur
> Im eignen Bruder kann zerstören,
> Dass der, mit Knittel, Sens' und Beil
> Den Bauern waffnend, schmählich Teil!
> Sich gen das eigne Blut muss kehren . . . .
> (p. 781)

to link the confusion of the peasants with that of these officers, Droste-Hülshoff has one of them conclude the discussion with the gloomy words: "Ihr Herrn, es naht der Jüngste Tag!" (p. 782), echoing the thoughts of the village woman. The reference to the approaching Day of Judgement has a further irony, for the battle is to take place the next morning.

The question which has already come up with respect to Annette von Droste-Hülshoff's use of the Thirty Years' War as a subject--is it not incongruous for a reserved poet to be writing about war--becomes even more interesting through her attempt to depict the battle. Her success in this attempt has evoked praise: "The description of the battle . . . is a tour de force of history made visual."[14] In the key word visual lies one of the reasons for whatever success this attempt enjoys, for it is the visual and aural metaphors which make the battle more than a chiaroscuro lifted from the chronologies. Throughout the poem, the war and the armies are presented by means of different figures which are brought together in the battle scene.

The single most effective metaphor is that of the storm, especially of the approaching storm. The comparison of military activity to a storm satisfied several demands put by the literary problem of how to describe the war: a storm is an impersonal force which is part of nature, was more or less unpredictable in those days, and spends itself in a brief span of time, leaving only its destructive traces. It is highly appropriate for the march of an army:

Ich sehe Arme, Speeres Wucht,

Ich sehe Nahen, sehe Flucht,
Und gleich entfernten Donners Grollen
Hör ich es leise zitternd rollen. (p. 746)

Very effectively, Droste-Hülshoff describes the countryside and the people as pausing in the anticipatory lull before the storm. A farmer listens until the wind brings the distant noise of the army:

Er glaubte in des Windes Zuge
Zu horchen wüster Stimmen Schall,
Und war es Furcht, was ihn betört,
Doch hatte jedes Ohr gehört
Des donnernden Geschützes Hall. (p. 748)

The gathering of the armies is likened to the building of a storm, with the sunlight on the armour flashing like the first lightning:

Stieg denn das Wetter auf? Es blitzt,
Entlang die Zweige zuckt der Strahl,
Und alle Fenster klirren auf. (p. 757)

The coming of Tilly's army is similarly depicted as an approaching storm which cannot at first be distinguished:

Doch horch, Gemurmel!--'s ist der Wind,
Und das Gewitter steigt geschwind. (p. 774)

Suddenly, it appears:

Und Zug auf Zug, aus Waldeshagen
Sieht man die schwarzen Säule ragen,
Sich endlos die Kolonne zeigt,
Wie drüben Wetterwolke steigt . . . . (p. 776)

In a reinforcement of the metaphor which nearly overwhelms it, Droste-Hülshoff has an actual thunderstorm mark Tilly's arrival. The weather imagery is continued through to the actual battle, as the breaking of Christian's line is compared to the melting of

snow in the sun:

> Allmählich schmolz des Herzogs Heer,
> Wie Schneeball unterm Sonnenstich;
> Viel Tausend lagen kalt umher. (p. 804)

A second complex of metaphors or comparisons is one already used by both Grimmelshausen and Schiller, that of war as hunting. While Grimmelshausen employed the analogy of the hunt to describe the conduct of war as such, in this case it refers to Christian's situation, fleeing from more powerful opponents. The comparison is implicit in the first scene of Christian and his exhausted men stopping for a drink of water. The meaning of various details--the wild look, the haste, the spots of blood--only becomes clear at the end of the passage: "Der tolle Braunschweig ist geschlagen." (p. 751) The exhaustion of Christian's army comes to mind again in the reference at the beginning of the section to a tapestry which hangs in the camp of Tilly, who has been pursuing Christian. This tapestry shows a spent deer in the woods:

> Gespannt auf der Tapete ruht,
> Wo schaumbedeckt, mit Todesmühen,
> Ins Dickicht scheint der Hirsch zu fliehen.
> (pp. 778-779)

A further reference to hunting is made in the battle passage:

> Da plötzlich wie ein Ebertross,
> Der knirschend vor dem Jäger rennt,
> Heran der Sparsche Landsknecht schoss . . . .
> (p. 806)

The theme is taken up again after Tilly's victory, when Christian's men are again in flight:

Wie Hirsche keuchend vor dem Hunde,
Nicht achtend Blutverlust und Wunde,
Sie stolpern längs dem weichen Grunde. (p. 811)

The series of images culminates in Christian, the object of this hunt, escaping across the border: "Dort mag, von Schaum und Dampf umhüllt,/ Verschnaufen das gehetzte Wild." (p. 813)

One especially interesting set of comparisons is that of games to human actions. Droste-Hülshoff makes ambivalent use of this comparison. On the one hand, she refers to games of chance, and to Fortuna, as if they were valid action principles: "Jetzt, wo Geschick die Würfel hält." On the other hand, there is the extended reference to the chess game in Tilly's camp. Chess, not being a game of chance, does not agree with the reference to dice, and virtually destroys the impact of the game metaphors on one level. It would seem that Droste-Hülshoff is using the reference to chance in the throw of dice to increase verisimilitude, since the importance of chance was a Baroque concept, but also recognizes the importance of strategy and skill in the conduct of war, exemplified through the chess reference. Nonetheless, both games of chance and of skill, when taken as analogies for human activity, pessimistically reduce man to a pawn, to a counter, subject to a larger incomprehensible process.

Droste-Hülshoff makes good use of aural as well as visual descriptors. One example is the sound of the trumpets on the morning of the battle. Unlike the indistinct murmur of armies at a distance, the trumpets strike a decisive note, as the first clap of thunder signals the onset of the storm.

However, despite these details, one cannot say that this is a "realistic" account of a battle. It has the carefully composed order that a painting of the battle might have. The battle is observed from some vantage point above and outside the struggle, but with flashes of close-up detail, such as the beads of sweat or blood. The major figures are the focal points, and the ordinary troops can appear only metaphorically as a "wall", or in isolated incidents. The outcome of the battle is the foregone end to which the account is directed: only those points are mentioned which will explain Christian's defeat.

Nevertheless, this attempt to utilize the subject matter of the Thirty Years' War is an interesting experiment. Perhaps most interesting is the strongly subjective element in the response of Droste-Hülshoff to the war. Certainly neither Grimmelshausen nor Schiller could preclude being subjective in their works, but Droste-Hülshoff's involvement displays an urgency deeply rooted in her own psychological makeup and in her fears for her community.

Adalbert Stifter's Der Hochwald

In one respect, there seem to be few points of similarity between "Die Schlacht im Loener Bruch" and the slow movement of Adalbert Stifter's novelle Der Hochwald (1841), which is almost devoid of action. Yet Stifter comes very close to Droste-Hülshoff in his depiction of the idyllic calm of nature which is in contrast to and disturbed by the Thirty Years' War. With a careful and loving eye for detail, he describes the wild landscape "on the

midnight side of Austria."[15] In the middle of the landscape stands a castle which is totally ruined:

> Ein grauer viereckiger Turm steht auf grünem Weidengrunde, von schweigendem zerfallenem Aussenwerke umgeben, tausend Gräser, und schöne Waldblumen, und weisse Steine im Hofraume hegend, und von aussen umringt mit vielen Platten, Knollen, Blöcken, und andern wunderlichen Granitformen, die ausgesäet auf dem Rasen herumliegen.[16]

Stifter, like Droste-Hülshoff, anticipated the conclusion of the story by presenting the ruined castle at the beginning. From the ruins, the reader is transported back two hundred years to the castle as it then stood:

> Und nun, lieber Wanderer, wenn du dich satt gesehen hast, so gehe jetzt mit mir zwei Jahrhunderte zurück . . . streue dafür weissen Sand bis an die Vormauer, setze ein tüchtig Buchentor in den Eingang und ein sturmgerechtes Dach auf den Turm, spiegelnde Fenster in die Mauern, teile die Gemächer und ziere sie mit all dem lieben Hausrat und Flitter der Wohnlichkeit . . . . (p. 262)

The castle was inhabited by two sisters, Clarissa and Johanna, and their elderly father. They lived a peaceful life, for, although the Thirty Years' War is on, their residence is so out of the way that it has not yet been touched by the war. News did get to the girls through rumours, though: they have heard of a miller who was shot for doing business with the Swedes (p. 267). In addition, their father has been following the war through correspondence, although he has tried to isolate his daughters from the war:

> Ich habe euch stets mit Nachrichten aus den Kriegsfeldern verschont, dass euer Herz nicht mit Dingen beleidigt werde, die ihr lieber nicht wisset, aber

> ich habe ein Netz über alle Kriegsplätze gesponnen, dass ich stets Kenntnis der schwebenden Sachlage und Voraussicht der künftigen behielt . . . . (p. 272)

Fearing that they will no longer be able to escape the effects of the war, the father has made plans to send the girls deep into the forest, the "Hochwald," there to wait until peace returns. Stifter devotes inordinate attention to telling how the girls make their way through roundabout and hidden paths to the "oasis" in the wilderness. The father has taken immense precautions to ensure that no one knows of the girls' hiding place, and that should anyone come too close, they would be able to retreat deeper yet into the woods. In effect, the father wants to take the girls out of the historical situation. Since he cannot move them through time in the way that Stifter has moved the reader through time, he relies upon space to isolate them.

However, all these precautions will prove futile. The effects of the war cannot be avoided by flight. One physical intrusion from the outside world is the arrival of Clarissa's long-absent admirer, Ronald, who has been serving in the Swedish army. By placing Ronald on the Protestant side, Stifter was able to give the religious conflict of the Thirty Years' War a personal dimension, for the girls are Catholic. Ronald predicts that the war will end soon ("dieser unheilvolle Krieg wird enden, muss bald enden") and promises to marry Clarissa when it does. The reader with prior knowledge of the Thirty Years' War knows, of course, from the internal evidence, that it is still several years until peace will be restored. In the meanwhile, Ronald will try to prevent the Swedish troops from destroying the girls' home. He

should be able to do so since he is a friend of the Swedish commander.

Stifter has ensured that the girls will not be cut off from the war in another way: they have a telescope with which they can just see their home at the edge of the forest. It is their cruel fate to look out one day and see that the castle is roofless and has been darkened by fire: "Sogleich trat Johanna vor das Glas, der Würfel stand darinnen, aber siehe, er hatte kein Dach, und auf dem Mauerwerke waren fremde schwarze Flecken." (p. 346) Suddenly, the meaninglessness of their physical safety outside the society and outside the range of war is apparent. Their persons may be safe from harm, but they cannot fully escape the painful effects of the war, for they still have ties to the society they have left, and are not spared any of the mental anguish caused by the war. Indeed, the uncertainty and helplessness their isolation has left them in intensifies their distress. The quiet of the forest is suddenly transformed into an unfriendly environment, just as the heath and moor at Loener Bruch suddenly opposed the men. There is something inhuman in the unchanging stillness of the forest:

> Es war ein unheimlicher Gedanke, dass in diesem Augenblicke dort vielleicht ein gewaltiges Kriegsgetümmel sei und Taten geschehen, die ein Menschenherz zerreissen können: aber in der Grösse der Welt und des Waldes war der Turm selbst nur ein Punkt, von Kriegsgetümmel ward man gar nichts inne, und nur die lächelnde schöne Ruhe stand am Himmel und über der ganzen Einöde. (p. 347)

The girls wait for news and when none comes send out a messenger, but he does not return. Abruptly, the seventh chapter opens several weeks or months later at the ruined castle, with the

coming of a single rider. Stifter is graphic in painting the desolation of the castle and of the lives ofits inhabitants. The full irony of the situation is yet to be revealed. The Swedes were intending to march past without disturbing the castle, but then, upon being attacked by the Imperial forces, turned the castle into the centre of the battleground. When Roland arrived, he persuaded the Swedes to give up the siege and was riding up with the good news. Suddenly, the father, recognizing Roland, angrily hurled a lance at him, inciting the Swedes to attack again and ultimately destroy the castle. Twice, the father's actions had the opposite effect of what he intended: although they have avoided the physical destruction, the girls have not been spared the psychological suffering caused by the war through their isolation in the forest, and the father's inexplicable act against Roland ensures his own destruction. Stifter seems to be arguing that it is folly for people to expect their own planning to ensure a happy future, a pessimistic enough position.[17]

The Thirty Years' War as such is only peripheral to the story, so it is perhaps not really valid to inquire after Stifter's portrayal of the war. Stifter does not attempt a large-scale reconstruction of the war, but shows on a microcosmic level in the experience of a few individuals that the effects of the war were omnipresent. The destruction of the castle turns out to be without historical significance, for that way was strategically poor and no army passed that way again. The senselessness of the destruction is counterpoised against the peace and order of nature, God's great garden, as Stifter puts it, where the taking of life

has a purpose.

Stifter's use or failure to use historical sources in Hochwald is quite different than in his great historical novel Witiko. In later years, he apologized for his "misuse" of history in the novelle:

> Im Hochwald habe ich die Geschichte als leichtsinniger junger Mensch über das Knie gebrochen, und sie dann in die Schubfächer meiner Phantasie hineingepfropft. Ich schäme mich jetzt beinahe jenes kindischen Gebarens. Jetzt steht mir das Geschehene fast wie ein ehrfurchtgebietender Fels vor Augen, und die Frage ist jetzt nicht mehr die "was soll ich mit ihm tun?" sondern: "was ist er!"[18]

This scepticism of Stifter's about the nature of history leads us to Wilhelm Raabe, who was if anything more sceptical about written history, as his treatment of the Thirty Years' War shows.

Wilhelm Raabe's Else von der Tanne

Wilhelm Raabe's novelle Else von der Tanne (1863) is deceptive in its straightforward simplicity. Disarmed by Raabe's pretense of ingenuousness, one can easily overlook the details which demonstrate not only his technical literary skill, but also his knowledge of history and his telling social criticism. There is nothing casual in his writing; even the title reveals the complexitites of his prose.

The full title, with the subtitle, is Else von der Tanne oder Das Glück Domini Friedemann Leutenbachers, armen Dieners am Wort Gottes zu Wallrode im Elend. The "von" in this case does not indicate aristocratic origins, but exactly the opposite, for the destitute Else lives with her father in the forest. It is

possible that Raabe may have intended this play on words as a gentle nudge to the title-conscious German bourgeoisie, reminding them that not every "von" guaranteed an aristocrat. The subtitle consists of two parts: the subject, "Glück," and the extended modifying phrase. This phrase contains a good deal of information: it tells us the name of the other central character, his position, and his place of residence. Again, there is an implied contrast between the self-importance of Friedemann's title and his actual station in life. And, almost at the end, recessed within a prepositional phrase, comes the key word in the title, "Elend." This word is linked in modern German with "misery," but is actually from the Old High German elilenti, meaning "in a foreign country" or "exiled."[19] As Nietzsche pointed out, "a German will understand the original connotations of Elend,"[20] and with it Raabe indicates one of the major themes of the work: the individual outside the community cannot be happy.

Such allusiveness on Raabe's part should make one wary when examining his treatment of the Thirty Years' War. Two kind of comments re-occur several times in the literature on Raabe. The one mentions that Raabe had read widely in historical writings, but point out that the story of Else von der Tanne is "entirely fictitious."[21] The other downplays the significance of the Thirty Years' War within the story:

> Im Handlungsverlauf tritt der Krieg in den Hintergrund und erscheint als der kleinste Teil der Erzählung, deren Hauptthema die Einsamkeit des Menschen unter den Menschen ist. Die Kriegsgreuel beeinflussen weder Else noch den Prediger in ihrer Einstellung zu den Menschen.[22]

However, a close reading of the story reveals that on the contrary the war is an important element of the whole and does influence the characters in their attitudes and actions.

Neither is it clear in what sense the novelle is "fictitious." If one were to consider it as an essay on the Thirty Years' War, ignoring for a moment the presence of plot and character, then this work appears more "factual," more "realistic," than many historical books contemporary with it might. Raabe could, as a writer, make free use of one stylistic device to achieve "realism" which is denied to the historian, namely irony. By means of irony Raabe can let the reader know that he as an author is aware of the limitations upon every statement's claim to represent reality. Again, the smallest details become significant. At the beginning of the work, for example, reference is made to the Thirty Years' War as a whole; at the end, the historical certainty embodied in this periodization is missing:

> Heute sind von dem Dorf Wallrode im Elend nur noch geringe Trümmer im Wald zu erblicken; es ist nicht auszusagen, nicht an den Fingern herzuzählen, was niederging durch diesen deutschen Krieg, welcher dreissig Jahre gedauert hat.[23]

The narrator replaces the idea of the Thirty Years' War as a unit by the more careful remark that the war "lasted thirty years." The interpolation of the remark that it cannot be fully said, cannot be enumerated on one's fingers, what the war's consequences were, further stresses the uncertainty in the account.

This uncertainty was consistent with Raabe's awareness that the transformation of an event into narrated history never had

the rigorous logic of a geometric proof, and that what we believe about the past is open to doubt. Even as recent and documentable an event as the Battle of Leipzig was clouded by doubt, as Raabe noted in Abu Telfan:

> In der Nähe von Leipzig soll der Fürst Schwarzenberg den Kaiser Napoleon geschlagen haben, was jedenfalls eine grosse Merkwürdigkeit wäre, wenn es sich beweisen liesse. Wir wollen aber die Sache in der Dunkelheit beruhen lassen, in welcher sie uns von unsern Vätern überliefert wurde--die alten Herren wussten nicht genauer als wir, wer eigentlich bei Leipzig den Kaiser Napoleon geschlagen habe.[24]

Given this realization of the difficulties involved in the search for "hard, cold facts" in history, it is likely that Raabe chose a "fictional" episode through which to portray the Thirty Years' War because it would be, if anything, more realistic. In Aristotelian terms, Raabe returned to the universal truth of poetry, but within a historical framework. By creating characters and placing them into the past, he could ensure that they at least would be absolutely true. Thus, he avoided the considerations which plagued the Schillerian re-creation of historical personages, and did not fall prey to the mistakes made in this regard by Conrad Ferdinand Meyer.

The significance of the portrayal of the Thirty Years' War in Else von der Tanne is somewhat involved. Three contexts may be distinguished for the function of the Thirty Years' War theme for Raabe. First, there is Raabe's interpretation of the effect of the war on German history, an effect which he saw as extending up to his present. Second, there was his concern about the threat and

impact of war in the nineteenth century. Finally, there is the role of the war within the work.

Although by comparison with the catastrophes of the twentieth century the wars of the nineteenth assume an air of quaintness, for a sensitive man such as Raabe, they loomed as a continual threat to civilization. Permeating his statements on war is a feeling of helplessness and weakness, of inability to prevent the destruction of individual happiness by impersonal military force. The preface to Sperlinggasse, written in 1864, opens with the poignant image of birds seeking shelter from the storm: "Wenn es gewittert, verkriechen sich die Vögel unter dem Busch."[25] Raabe goes on to indicate that the ordinary citizen really can do litte more than creep into seclusion when war batters on the gates:

> Nun hängen wieder die Wolken drohend herab; der Krieg schlägt mit gewappneter Faust dröhnend an die Pforten unseres eigenen Volkes, und es ist niemand, so hoch oder niedrig ihn das Leben gestellt habe, der sagen kann, welch ein Schicksal ihm die nächste Stunde bringen werde.[26]

This uncertainty in a time of war is brought out clearly in Else von der Tanne.

The story, told in a complex framework, is basically a simple one. Friedemann Leutenbacher, the pastor of Wallrode, is trying to prepare his Christmas sermon. He begins to daydream about Else, who had come with her father to live outside the village twelve years earlier. Her father, Master Conrad, had been a teacher in the city of Magdeburg. After its destruction, he had decided to flee out into the isolation of the forest, seeking, like the father in Hochwald, to protect his daughter from the

harmful effects of war. Gradually, Friedemann falls in love with Else, but the villagers fear and hate her and her father as strangers. When the two come to church, the superstitious villagers wound Else. The news of her death interrupts his daydreams. Greatly agitated, Friedemann hurries to her hut, and then rushes out into the winter night, where he dies.

Raabe describes the effects of the Thirty Years' War, not the war itself. The war is actually over at the time the story opens in December, 1648, although this news has not reached Wallrode yet. Had the news been known earlier, it might have been possible for Master Conrad and Else to leave the forest, and she might not have died. This implies that the effects of the war extend beyond its fixed chronological limits, extending into the future, just as they reach into the most hidden corners of the forest.

Although there are no direct scenes of violence comparable to those of Grimmelshausen, Droste-Hülshoff or Döblin, Raabe manages to bring in many of the usual references to the cruelty of the war. The Pastor bears the marks of war on his own person:

> Um seine Handgelenke trug er die blutigroten Spuren und Striemen der Stricke und Riemen, welche ihm die Raubgesellen des General Pfuhl, der sich rühmte, allein achthundert Dörfer verbrannt zu haben, anlegten, als sie ihn zwischen den Gäulen fortschleppten in den Wald. (pp. 161-162)

Raabe does not claim that the general <u>did</u> burn the villages, only that the general claims to have done so. Even if it were not true, such a boast would offer an insight into the psychology of the times.

The introduction of Master Conrad allows Raabe to bring the influence of two historical events into Wallrode and into the story.

In his reflections, Friedemann places Else's coming in the "Swedish period," which began with the Battle of Wittstock:

> Es war eine so seltsame, so wunderliche Geschichte. Bannier hatte am vierundzwanzigsten September sechzehnhundertsechsunddreissig die Sachsen und Kaiserlichen bei Wittstock in grimmigster Feldschlacht geschlagen und war Herr in Deutschland. Achtzigtausend Feinde erwürgte er, und sechshundert Fahnen und Standarten gewann er während seiner Kriegführung . . . . (p. 164)

Raabe does not make it clear whether he agrees with this account or whether it is only the opinion held by Friedemann. Raabe's personal sentiments on the other historical event which he brings up, the destruction of Magdeburg, may be deduced from the fact that he wrote a poem on the subject several years before writing the novelle. This poem appears as a "folksong" sung by Else:

> Vierzehn lange, lange Wochen
> Gab die Liga Sturm auf Sturm,
> Vierzehn lange, lange Wochen
> Trotzte Mauer, Wall und Turm.
> Tapfre, fromme, teutsche Bürger
> Schützen Glauben, Ehr und Hause,--
> Dreissigtausend Ketzerleben
> Rottet heut die Kirche aus! (p. 178)

Novel in the story is Raabe's focus on the aftermath of the siege, as people struggle to rebuild their city and their lives among the ruins: "Auf die erste stumpfsinninge Betäubung folgte die gottlästernde, täglich wachsende Melancholie." (p. 177) Despairing, Master Conrad flees the ruins and human society for the security of the forest.

Unfortunately, flight does not bring them beyond the pale of war. After the years of suffering in the war, the villagers are

mistrustful of any strangers. Like Schiller and Droste-Hülshoff, Raabe shows that the destruction of social and moral order results in a breakdown of values on the individual level: "Die Welt sei nun einmal wie ausgewechselt und so falsch, schlecht und blutig, dass ein jeglicher sich hüten solle und dass keiner auf sich mehr lade, als er müsse." (p. 169) Scarred by the war, Master Conrad does little to allay the villagers' suspicions, which finally come to a head in an outburst of violence. Through the failure of the community and the outsiders to establish a harmoniuos relationship, Raabe underlines the message that the visible effects of the war are paralleled by invisible psychological ones. Even the pastor is immersed in bitterness, unable to think of his charges as people in need. He finds his solace in the soulless nature and regards the villagers as little better than savages:

> Dann seufzte er tief und schwer; durch das Gestöber im Dunkel glimmerten zwei oder drei Lichter seines Dorfes, doch da er wusste, welche tierische Verdummung, welche Schmach und welcher Jammer des Menschen um diese matten Flämmchen kauerten, so wandte sich sein Geist auch von ihnen ab, um angstvoll suchend weiterzuirren; und immer finsterer ward die Nacht, immer heftiger der Sturm. (p. 163)

Else perceives correctly that instead of responding to actual human needs, Friedemann--like her father--lives under the shadow of the past. Her dying words implore him to forget the past, to think of the children: "er soll das Vergangene von sich werfen und soll der Kinder gedenken und zu den Alten reden wie zu den Kindern." (p. 194) But Friedemann can no longer free himself from the stark visions of the past, and denies that there can be a future, since God has removed his protection from the world.

Friedemann dies alone, in the absolute isolation of the solipsist who has broken all ties to his community and to God. It is this spiritual devastation which Raabe deplores in his concluding sentence, more than the destruction of towns and cities.

One more aspect of Raabe's treatment of the Thirty Years' War could be mentioned. At several points, the narrator interrupts to call directly upon the reader's knowledge of the Thirty Years' War. Thereby, Raabe is able to place the war in his reader's past, can reinforce the impression that the effects of the war can still be felt centuries later. The parsonage is compared to the meanest hut today; the fear of the Swedish period lives on in the stories told by the peasants. The emotional response of the villagers to the presence of Master Conrad is made actual by reference to similar reactions by the peasants of the nineteenth century to strangers: "Die Stelle bei der hohen Tanne wurde verrufen, und was das heissen wollte um die Zeit . . . mag sich jeder deuten, der weiss, was das böse Wort heute noch im Munde und Herzen des Volkes wiegt." (p. 172) The use of the first person plural brings the reader closer to Raabe's own viewpoint, to share Raabe's (the narrator's) lament against the influence of the past: "Gestern, gestern! Wer kann den Gram ermessen, welcher sich in dem kleinen Worte bergen kann?" (p. 76)

Raabe's use of the Thirty Years' War came very close to both Annette von Droste-Hülshoff and Stifter. Like them, he depicted the war as an event greater than the individual, an event which disturbed the calm of nature and ruined the lives of those involved. The last of the nineteenth century writers to be consid-

ered here, Conrad Ferdinand Meyer, also depicted the war as coming unexpectedly from the outside into a closed world. However, his idyll is the tidy world of the urban businessman, and his effort at portraying the war was not nearly as successful.

Conrad Ferdinand Meyer's Gustav Adolfs Page

Coming to Conrad Ferdinand Meyer's handling of the Thirty Years' War in the novelle Gustav Adolfs Page (1882) after the previous works is disappointing. It is of course unjust to dismiss all of Meyer's works on the basis of one short piece, but one cannot help feeling that in this instance Meyer's reach exceeded his grasp. It will be worthwhile to examine the work only briefly as an example of how the Thirty Years' War could be misused as a setting. However, before prejudicing the reader overmuch, it might be good to look at the work itself.

The plot is simple but unlikely. One morning, Gustavus Adolphus shocks a prosperous merchant family by inviting the son, August Leubelfing, to serve as his page. The cowardly son refuses to go and his cousin, Gustel, offers to go in his stead. Her disguise is not penetrated by the king because he is providentially shortsighted. Wounded while unsuccessfully protecting the king, Gustel dies, but not before disclosing that a traitor had been responsible for the king's death.

Meyer's own comments in his letters and papers give two clues about the origin of the plot. Meyer borrowed freely from historical sources for his stories and indicated that he wrote Gustav Adolfs Page with A.F. Gfrörer's Geschichte Gustav Adolfs

König von Schweden und seiner Zeit (Stuttgart, 1837) open on the desk beside him.[27] The reason for selecting the Thirty Years' War and especially Gustavus Adolphus for the story Meyer explained in a letter to H. Blum:

> Ich las Goethes Egmont und vertiefte mich in den Gedanken: es lohne wohl, ein Weib zu zeichnen, das ohne Hingabe, ja, ohne dass der Held nur eine Ahnung von ihrem Geschlecht hat, einem hohen Helden in verschwiegener Liebe folgt und für ihn in den Tod geht. Der Held müsste freilich sehr kurzsichtig sein, um nicht zu erkennen, dass sein Freund ein Weib ist. Gustav Adolf war hochgradig kurzsichtig. Ich machte seinen Pagen Leubelfing zu einem Mädchen.[28]

Meyer's attitude towards history would be merely flippant if one were to accept this at face value! However, Meyer did rise above this level, as his interest in the character of Gustavus Adolphus demonstrates. Furthermore, doubt has been raised about Meyer's claim that the idea of transforming the page into a girl was entirely his. Emil Ermatinger has argued that an unpublished play of Heinrich Laube's, Gustav Adolf, which had been performed in Breslau in 1830, might have a source. That play too had the transformation of a page into a girl and also presented the Swedish king as motivated by the desire for power. Ermatinger is able to show that Meyer had read Laube's Der deutsche Krieg and was acquainted with Laube through their common publisher, so his argument seems valid.[29]

Meyer's technique for writing historical literature consisted basically of evoking the spirit of the age through descriptive detail and then focussing on central characters. This is also true of Gustav Adolfs Page. The Thirty Years' War itself does not

become the object of attention, and there are only sketchy references to battles. In the middle of the stage is Gustavus Adolphus. Meyer tries to show the two opposing motives in Gustavus Adolphus, the religious and the political. Upon hearing the cry of "Long live Gustav, King of Germany," the king does not reject the possibility that he would like to have that title, saying merely that such things ought not to be said. However, Meyer's characterization of Gustavus is by no means on the same level as Schiller's Wallenstein or even Droste-Hülshoff's Christian as a complex character torn by different motives.

In the second chapter, Gustavus is shown in his cosy camp, with his wife, laughing and scolding Gustel for using coarse language: "Aber Gust . . . du schwörst ja wie ein Papist oder Heide! Ich werde an dir zu erziehen haben."[30] The war does not intrude upon this cheerful camp life. Although busy leading daily attacks upon an enemy stronghold, the king has time for games and relaxation in the evening:

> In dieser späten Freistunde sass er dann behaglich in seinem Sessel zurückgelehnt und Page Leubelfing auf einem Schemel daneben. Da wurde Dame gezogen oder Schach gespielt und im Brettspiele schlug der Page zuweilen den König. (p. 142)

The contrast between Droste-Hülshoff and Meyer is brought out distinctly by their respective use of games: for the former, they were a statement on the fate of men at war, for the latter they are pleasant pastimes. It is hard for the reader to accept Gustavus the amiable father and Gustavus the aspirant for the German throne as one person.

Fatherliness also characterizes Meyer's portrayal of Gustavus as commander. Angered by the misconduct of his officers, the king calls them together to deliver what Meyer claims is a harsh harangue. Although the content of this speech is heavily based on Gfrörer, it shows the dangers of putting words into the mouths of historical figures. One cannot quite accept the King of Sweden saying "Schande über euch!" and "Pfui! Mir ekelt vor euch!" (p. 154), much less "Rebelliert ihr gegen mich . . . so will ich mich an der Spitze meiner Finnen und Schweden mit euch herumhauen, dass die Fetzen fliegen!" (p. 155) Similar trite phrases come up in the meeting between Gustavus Adolphus and Wallenstein. Although it might have been an effective scene in the hands of a Schiller or a Hebbel, the fictive coming together of the two commanders borders on the banal here. Wallenstein has come to warn Gustavus Adolphus that there is a traitor in the Swedish camp, which is in itself not the most plausible of pretexts, and the two find a moment for gossip about their families:

> 'Die Majestät,' endete der Friedländer fast gemütlich seinen Besuch, 'sollte sich wenigstens ihrem Kinde erhalten. Die Prinzess lernt brav, wie ich höre, und ist der Majestät an das Herz gewachsen. Wenn man keine Söhne hätte! Ich bin auch solch ein Mädchen-papa! (p. 161)

The fault of the entire work is apparent in the portrayal of these two generals meeting. Unsure of himself in an area where he had no personal experience, Meyer borrowed his characterizations from a world he knew better, the world of the Swiss middle class. As a result, he came close to writing kitsch in this novelle: a number

of descriptions of "authentic" details and speeches lifted from history books cannot compensate for the disproportions of the work.

With Meyer, the treatment of the Thirty Years' War seems to be unable to rise above a literary plateau. There seemed to be little that one could add to the achievements of Grimmelshausen, Schiller and other writers who had used the war as a subject matter. However, the upheavals of the twentieth century, both literary and political, were to produce radically different approaches to the Thirty Years' War in the work of Döblin and Brecht.

Notes to Chapter IV

[1] Studien zur Wirkungsgeschichte des deutschen historischen Romans 1850-1875 (Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1971), p. 90.

[2] ibid., pp. 101; 173-176.

[3] Theodore K. Rabb, "The Effects of the Thirty Years' War on the German Economy," The Journal of Modern History, 34 (1962), 41-42.

[4] On the problem of defining "Biedermeier," see Max Wundt, "Die Philosophie in der Zeit des Biedermeiers," DVjs, 13 (1935), 118-148; Karl Simon, "Biedermeier in der bildenden Kunst," DVjs, 13 (1925), 59-90; Paul Kluckhohn, "Biedermeier als literarische Epochenbezeichnung," DVjs, 13 (1935), 1-43; and Marlene J. Norst, "Biedermeier," Periods in German Literature, ed. James M. Ritchie (London: Oswald Wolff, 1968), pp. 147-170.

[5] Norst, "Biedermeier," Periods in German Literature, p. 159.

[6] Annette von Droste-Hülshoff (London: Methuen, 1965), p. 221.

[7] Einsamkeit. Das Leben der Annette von Droste-Hülshoff (Zürich: Artemis, 1964), p. 212.

[8] "The Reflected Self in Annette von Droste's Work: A Challenge to Self-Discovery," Monatshefte, 61 (1969), 58.

[9] See Wilhelm Gössmann, "Das politische Zeitbewusstsein der Droste," Jahrbuch der Drostegesellschaft, 5 (1972), 102-122.

[10] Clemens Heselhaus, Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. Werk und Leben (Düsseldorf: August Bagel, 1971), p. 103.

[11] Quoted in ibid., p. 104.

[12] She relied especially upon Franz Christoph Khevenhiller's Annalium Ferdinandeorum, Zehender Teil (Leipzig, 1724), according to Silvia Bonati-Richner, Der Feuermensch. Studien über das Verhältnis von Mensch und Landschaft in den erzählenden Werken der Annette von Droste-Hülshoff (Bern: Francke, 1972), p. 163, note 54. The edition of Droste's works edited by Schulte-Kemminghausen gives her notes to the ballad, while the edition edited by Clemens Heselhaus as the Sämtliche Werke (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962), gives some of these notes, pp. 1153-1155.

On Sir Walter Scott's significance for European historical literature in the nineteenth century, see Georg Lukacs, The Historical Novel, trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), pp. 29-69; Lawrence M. Price, The Reception of English Literature in Germany (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932), pp. 373-393; and John H. Raleigh, "What Scott Meant to the Victorians," Victorian Studies, 7 (1963), 8-34. In addition to her own reading, a stimulus for Droste-Hülshoff's interest in Scott was probably Levin Schücking, whose father read the children Scott novels; see Reinhold Conrad Muschler, "Vorwort," to the Briefe von Annette von Droste-Hülshoff und Levin Schücking, ed. R. C. Muschler (Leipzig: Fr. Wilhelm Grunow, 1928), p. xv.

13 Annette von Droste-Hülshoff, "Die Schlacht im Loener Bruch," Sämtliche Werke, ed. Clemens Heselhaus (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962), pp. 813-814. Subsequent references to the text from this edition shall be given in parentheses after the quotation.

14 Mare, Annette von Droste-Hülshoff, p. 220.

15 On the function of the dandscape description in Hochwald, see Roy Pascal, "Die Landschaftsschilderung im Hochwald," Adalbert Stifter Studien und Interpretationen. Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage (Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm, 1968), pp. 57-68.

16 Adalbert Stifter, Hochwald, in Erzählungen in der Urfassung, ed. Max Stefl (Augsburg: Adam Kraft, 1950), p. 260. Subsequent references given in parentheses.

17 On Stifter's pessimism, see Konrad Steffen, Adalbert Stifter. Deutungen (Basel/ Stuttgart: Birkhäuser, 1955), pp. 69-74.

18 Quoted in Philip H. Zoldester, Adalbert Stifters Weltanschauung (Bern: Herbert Lang, 1970), p. 158.

19 Friedrich Kluge, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, ed. Walther Mitzka (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967), p. 163.

20 Friedrich Nietzsche, Zur Genealogie der Moral, in Werke, eds. Giorgio Colli and Mazzio Montinari (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968), VI, ii, 323.

21 Stanley Radcliffe, "Wilhelm Raabe, the Thirty Years' War and the Novelle," German Life and Letters, N.S. 22 (1969), 220.

[22] Gertrud Brate, "Form und Inhalt in Wilhelm Raabes 'Else von der Tanne oder das Glück Domini Friedemann Leutenbachers, Armen Dieners am Wort Gottes zu Wallrode im Elend," Jahrbuch der Raabegesellschaft (1973), p. 69.

[23] Wilhelm Raabe, Else von der Tanne, in Sämtliche Werke, eds. Karl Hoppe, Hans Oppermann, and Hans Plischke (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962), p. 198. Subsequent references given in parentheses.

[24] Quoted in Friedrich Neumann, "Erlebte Geschichte in Raabes Erzählung 'Im Siegeskranze'," Jahrbuch der Raabegesellschaft (1962), p. 109.

[25] Wilhelm Raabe, "Pro Domo," Sämtliche Werke, eds. Karl Hoppe, Hans Oppermann, and Hans Plischke (Göttingen: Wandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1950), p. 9.

[26] ibid.

[27] "Ich schrieb den Pagen Gfrörers Gust. Ad. neben mir aufgeschlagen." From a letter to Julius Rodenberg, November 5, 1882, quoted in Konrad Studentkowski, Der dreissigjährige Krieg im Spiegel der historischen Novelle. Ein Beitrag zur Stoffgeschichte und zur Geschichte der historischen Novelle (Jena: Fromannsche Buchhandlung, 1934), p. 46. Studentkowski prints several parallel passages from both Gfrörer and Meyer for comparison, pp. 47-49.

[28] Quoted in Georges Brunet, C.F. Meyer et la Nouvelle (Paris: Didier, 1967), p. 253.

[29] "Eine Quelle zu Konrad Ferdinand Meyers 'Gustav Adolfs Page'," Das literarische Echo, 19, No. 1 (1916), cols. 22-26.

[30] Conrad Ferdinand Meyer, Gustav Adolfs Page, in Sämtliche Werke in zwei Bänden (München: Winckler, 1968), I, 141. Subsequent references, all from this volume, given in parentheses.

CHAPTER V

DÖBLIN'S WALLENSTEIN

Long neglected by literary criticism, Alfred Döblin's novel Wallenstein is gaining recognition as one of the most fascinating experiments in the writing of historical literature. It is also a major innovation in the treatment of the Thirty Years' War.

Alfred Döblin is usually known as the author of a novel about life in the lower social strata of Berlin during the Weimar Republic, Berlin Alexanderplatz. It is hard for authors to break free of their fixed literary reputations, and Döblin himself regretted that he had become known as a "one book man." However, in recent years, there has been an awakening of positive critical interest in Döblin and his works. Günter Grass predicts the deep impact that Döblin will have on us as readers: "Er wird Sie beunruhigen; er wird Ihre Träume beschweren; Sie werden zu schlucken haben; er wird Ihnen nicht schmecken; unverdaulich ist er, auch unbekömmlich. Den Leser wird er ändern."[1] Wolfdietrich Rasch is ebullient in his praise of Wallenstein, calling it the great historical novel of the post World War I period.[2] And, in fact, coming to Wallenstein after having examined other works on the Thirty Years' War, one is taken aback at Döblin's achievement. What Döblin has in effect attempted in this novel is the impossible, or is impossible in the medium of printed prose: he has tried to convey the chaotic totality of the Thirty Years' War to the reader.

The immediate question that comes to mind is why Döblin should undertake such a literary experiment. The answers come from two

different directions. First, it was a reaction to the events of Döblin's time. He began Wallenstein during the First World War, in 1916, and completed it in 1918. There can be little doubt that, like Karl Kraus in Die letzten Tage der Menschheit, Döblin sought to capture the meaninglessness and chaos of that great confusion known as the World War in a literary work. Social responsibility and concern were always major factors in Döblin's writing, whether he was portraying the lower strata of Berlin society or the helplessness of modern man in the industrial age. For him, literature was a means, not an end. He wrote of himself that he did not take literature or art very seriously, because he did not consider them as ends in themselves. The author, he felt, should use words and literature for other, more serious purposes.[3] The serious purpose of Wallenstein is the transformation of the received image of war and of the Thirty Years' War, through a portrayal of its absurdity and brutality.

A second factor which shaped Wallenstein was Döblin's thought on literature and history. Wallenstein is virtually inconceivable without the innovations and experiments in the writing of prose made by the Expressionists. Döblin began as an Expressionist, and his early works were published beside those of other Expressionist poets in Der Sturm, but he did not remain in the movement's mainstream. Above all, Döblin's stress upon the need for literature to transmit objectively facts separated him from the Expressionist poets who were creating a mythology of the modern world. Döblin summarized his demands of literature in a call for the virtual exclusion of the author from his work:

> Der Psychologismus, der Erotismus muss fortgeschwemmt werden; Entselbstung, Entäusserung des Autors, Depersonation. Die Erde muss wieder dampfen. Los vom Menschen! Mut zur kinetischen Phantasie und zum Erkennen der unglaublichen realen Konturen! Tatsachenphantasie![4]

Döblin was quite aware of the difficulties inherent in the striving to realize this goal of eliminating authorial intrusion in the work and presenting the "unbelievable real shapes." Part of his awareness stemmed from his study and practice of medicine. He was cognizant of not only the philosophical problems involved in a striving for truthfulness, derived in part from his study of Nietzsche, but also of the practical problems, derived from a knowledge of psychology and the functioning of the nervous system, and from his own medical studies. Shortly before his death, Döblin recounted how he made his first scientific "observations," and the mild surprise he felt upon having his speculations accepted as new scientific "facts."[5] The scepticism of that moment remained with him, and he doubted all reported facts as guesses about the nature of reality. In literary practice, this scepticism brought Döblin close to a kind of Dadaism in his use of facts as elements of artistic composition. Rather than arranging and interpreting facts for the reader and thus introducing yet another layer of doubt between the things as they are and the reader, Döblin presented the facts themselves in a kind of montage or collage. The facts would speak for themselves and out of their juxtaposition a certain image would become apparent.[6]

This concern with factuality had further implications when Döblin turned his attention to historical works. He had little

confidence in the historians' claim to have succeeded in portraying the past objectively "the way it really was." In an address before the Prussian Academy of the Arts in March 1928, he maintained that the selection and arrangement of facts was already an "addition to reality" ("ein Zusatz zur Realität"), and that any such "additions" contradicted the intentions of scientific methods. Hence, a field of study such as history could a priori never be fully "scientific": "Ich bin nicht imstande, die Geschichte freilich trotz des unzweifelhaften Willens der Historiker auf Wissenschaft eine Wissenschaft zu nennen."[7] Nine years later he expanded upon such ideas in an essay on "We and the historical novel." As soon as there is more than one historian's interpretation of the past as embedded in the documents, he argued, doubt about which account of the past is the correct one must set in. This doubt extends itself to the whole enterprise of writing history:

> Ein allgemeines Wackeln ergreift schon immer die Geschichtsschreibung, wenn eine neue Klasse auftaucht. Und derjenige, der auf der Flucht vor den Lügnereien der Biographen und Romanautoren in die solide und wahrhaftige Historie sich begibt, ist aus dem Regen in die Traufe gekommen. Die Verzweifelung wird ihn übermannen, sofern er sich nicht entschliesst, bei einem einzigen Buch zu bleiben . . . . Denn zwei sind schon ärgerlich und drei vernichten jegliche Perspektive.[8]

The only accurate historical account is the barest of chronologies: "ehrlich ist nur Chronologie."[9] What then of the historical novel?

Paradoxically, Döblin held out the hope that the novelist

would be able to achieve what the professional historian could not, because the novelist could incorporate subject matter not amenable to treatment by the historian:

> Stoffgebiete, Räume der Realität, die man sonst in der geschriebenen Literatur nicht findet, finden im Roman ihren Platz, und nur hier. Das sind Dinge des intimeren und ganz intimen, persönlichen, persönlichen, dialogischen und gesellschaftlichen Lebens, Dinge des Individuums, der Geschlechter zueinander, der Liebe, der Ehe, der Freundschaft.[10]

Out of his knowledge of human nature, and with his freedom to imagine details never recorded by documents, the novelist would be able to approximate the totality of life in a past age much more closely than the historian. Furthermore, the novelist, as conscious master of his form, can make demands of the reader which the historian rarely can, for which Wallenstein is a good example. The historian may be interested in triggering some emotional response through his account of an event, but the conventional limitations which stipulate what "objective" prose may and may not be like exclude the literary techniques availabe to the novelist, such as stream-of-consciousness. The historian may state that the Thirty Years' War was "too fluctuating, oblique, contradictory and protracted to be recounted in any detail,"[11] but Döblin can go beyond this: he can attempt to make the reader feel the fluctuation and the contradiction. Reading the prose of Wallenstein can create in the reader the sensation of experiencing the jumbled past. Stylistic devices such as the abrupt transitions from one scene to another, or the change in rhythm from abrupt staccato phrases to long undulating sentences can convey an immediacy that

is not really possible through the usual style of historical writing.

Having said this, one is still left with a question and a problem. The question is how did Döblin try to convey a picture of the Thirty Years' War and also try to create a certain response to the war in the reader? It is easy enough to say that he reproduced the chaos of the war in the text, but were that true in a simple sense, we would be facing a jumble of letters and words to which we could hardly respond except with consternation. However, the prose does communicate, and there is a structure to the novel. This structure is not a plot in the usual sense, but the chronological sequence of historical events. Schiller, confronted by the formlessness of the past, circumvented the literary problems which resulted by giving the Thirty Years' War a plot, making it the tragic fate of Wallenstein. Döblin does not resort to this kind of emplotment in order to force the mass of facts and details into some order. Instead, he used the usual chronology of the Thirty Years' War, the fixed points such as battles, as the basic skeletal framework of the novel. However, the spaces between the dates in the timeline he filled with material which he imagined. The problem that remains after this question is how can one deal with this book in a few pages of this study? To summarize the plot would mean extracting the chronology from the novel's 860 pages, which would not produce new or useful information. For this reason, and because of its importance for understanding how Döblin achieves his effects, it is more profitable to focus on several isolated aspects of the work in an effort to come to grips

with the poetic process.

Although there are no chapters in the books into which the novel is subdivided, there are units of several paragraphs, marked off by a break and the initial capital letters. Of these semi-independent segments, the first opening one is important because it accustoms the reader to the texture of the prose, and deserves close examination.

"Nachdem die Böhmen besiegt waren, war niemand so froh wie der Kaiser."[12] This opening sentence gives the reader with previous knowledge of the history of the Thirty Years' War the historical context: it is after 1620, when Frederick has been defeated at the battle of the White Mountain and has fled. Döblin does not provide this date, however. Throughout, the lack of dates is noticeable. Nowhere does Döblin resort, like Schiller or Raabe did, to the use of a fictive chronicler who makes the temporal location and sequence of the events explicit. As Oskar Loerke pointed out, the presence of dates would detract from Döblin's concentration upon the phenomenon of the war by encouraging readers to consider this a "historical" novel.[13] Döblin does not evaluate, or would have us believe that he does not do so, the events of the Thirty Years' War; he would prefer to portray the war as something which is there, as Grimmelshausen did. For this reason, he does not start the novel with the beginning of the war in 1618 and does not end with the Peace of Westphalia. The novel is a cross section of a larger whole; it starts "after" and has no closed end.

Although one ought not to overtax one sentence with inter-

pretation, there is one other point in this opening line which might be mentioned. The passive construction of the subordinate clause, requiring no active subject, leaves unanswered the possible question of who has defeated the Bohemians. No general, no army, no agent is named. This small detail hints at one of the main thrusts of the whole work, namely that there is no one person, no director or direction, behind the perceived historical events. As Ferdinand mumbles in his derangement before his strange death, things run by themselves: "Es läuft alles von sich selbst." (II, 467)

The bulk of the introductory section is devoted to the description of a feast at the court. The two features of this description which impress themselves upon the reader are the wealth of detail and the contrasts between splendour and ghastliness. Everything is lavishly described. The clothing is rich with colour: "rot schimmernd die seidene knopfgeschlossene Soutane, purpurn unter dem Tisch die Beine mit Strümpfen und Schuhen, bei den schneeweissen zappelnden der deutschen Majestät." (I, 9) The chickens are an occasion in themselves:

> Die Hühner sind erschlagen; auf Silberschüsseln gebahrt; von feinen weissen Kerzen beleuchtet. Die Blicke von zwanzig Gewaltherren und Fürsten voll Lobs auf sie gerichtet; in Mandelmilch schaukeln die Rümpfe, Beinchen und Hälse, Rosinen zum Haschen um sie gebreitet, ihre kandierten Schnäbelchen füllend. (I, 10)

These lavish descriptions do more than set the stage. They communicate the desire of this court society for show and pomp, for ornately embellished things which are devoured, both figuratively

and literally.

Consumption seems to be the main interest and drive of those present at the banquet. The Emperor is reduced to an eating machine by the repeated description of his mouth moving, ingesting. This idea is reinforced through one of Döblin's favoured stylistic devices, parataxis, as in the synonyms for "ate": "Kaute, knabberte, biss, riss, mahlte, malmte." (I, 9) Eating is carried on with fervour, without pauses, and the only complaint is that the waiters are too slow in serving and that the body has a limited capacity: "die Gurgel kann nicht mehr schlucken als sie fasst." (I, 10) This gorging is accompanied but not interrupted by two contrasting pictures presented by the narrator. The one is that of the defeated Frederick, wandering through the streets begging for food:

> Keiner da, der mir was zu fressen gibt? Zehn Kinder und kein Ende, keiner da, der uns den Bauch stopft? Habe die englische Königstochter zur Frau, in Böhmen war ich König; das 'war' freut mich armen Hansen wenig. (I, 10)

This is the first reference to political events after the opening sentence, but it is also the point when the first doubts and queries about the narrative come in. Until this point the reader has been able to accept the narrator's words at face value, but one hesitates at this point. It is unlikely that even a defeated king would wander through the streets as a beggar. If he did, who would have recorded his words? Not only is this an unhistorical story; it is an improbable story. Who then is telling it? It would seem that one of the court nobles might have been telling it, but the narrator gives no indication of which specific

person has done so. It is just a story which is told at the court, a rumour. In this way, Döblin can show the reader what the historian can only refer to, namely that Frederick was "jeered or pitied as the 'winter king'"[14] by his contemporaries. The "fictional" words of Frederick are not only based on fact, but also acquire the stature of a fact within the work. The story also foreshadows the fate of Döblin's Ferdinand and, with its crass language, comments upon the rich feast at the Emperor's table. Stripped of its veneer of colour and adornment, the aristocratic fascination with food and clothing is nothing more than the elementary desire to "have one's stomach filled." For Döblin's philosophy of history, biological urges, such as the simple desire to survive, lay at the heart of human activities. The political machinations of Ferdinand's court have ultimately no meaning beyond who shall hold power and feast, and who shall be defeated and starve. The desire to hold on to power is an expression of biological needs. The close connection is again underscored by the fact that while they are dismembering the roasted chickens, the abbots and lords are mentally dividing up the spoils of those recently vanquished.

The second intrusion upon the feast is more fantastic than the first, but also develops the theme of consumption in this society. The sudden blare of the trumpets awakens memories of Frederick in the minds of those around the table and a gruesome vision of the enemy dead riding through the hall:

> . . . prächtig zerhiebene Pfälzerleichen, Rumpf ohne Kopf, Augen ohne Blicke, Karren, Karren voll

> Leichen, eselgezogen, von Pulverdunst und Gestank eingehüllt, in Kisten wie Baumäste gestaucht, kippend, wippend, hott, hott durch die Luft. (I, 12)

This procession of death during the feast suggests that the war is another manifestation of this society's rapacious consumption. In the same way that wine and food are processed, so have the piled corpses been wasted in the war, as if there were no shortage of men and no better use for them. The vision does not otherwise disturb the meal, and everyone continues to enjoy the "gebackene Muscheln, Törtchen und Konfitüren."

The introductory section brings up the problem of Döblin's narrative technique. It is difficult to locate the narrator in these descriptions, or to specify what kind of narrative technique this is. In one respect, the narrator is omniscient: he has access to the inner thoughts of all the characters. He can tell us what Ferdinand is thinking or would like to do, and can interpret the emotions of the entire company at once. But there are limitations upon the narrator. He never breaks out of the fixed situation to indicate what will happen next or to evaluate what is happening. The story seems to occur in the present, without the illusion that the narrator is a participant in the events, or that he shares the world view of the participants. Döblin has succeeded quite well in excluding the author from the work. One might compare the narrative technique to the careful report of a scientist recording an experiment, recording all the details which catch his trained eye, but reserving judgement on the meaning of the event.

Döblin uses various techniques of expressionist prose writing to good effect. Nongrammatical fragments can evoke action or pro-

vide a quick insightful flash of an event. One device used by Döblin is the listing of words which are nearly equivalent in meaning, unseparated by commas or any punctuation. This kind of parataxis stresses points or reinforces images, but it has another function in the novel as a whole: it introduces an element of uncertainty into the account of the past. Rather than selecting a verb or a noun for the reader, Döblin frequently gives two or three possible terms: "Rufen Lachen" (I, 24), "Giessen Strömen des Bluts" (I, 25), "wehmütig demütig" (I, 32), "Rasseln Klirren Dröhnen" (I, 103), to pick only a few examples. The reader then has several responses: he can pick only one of the terms as the correct one, he can accept them all, he can reject them all, or he can postpone a selection, remaining in ambivalent expectation of what is to come. In effect, by the frequent use of equally possible descriptors, Döblin has not written one novel, but a number of novels. The effect of this multiplicity of texts is to generate in the reader an unwillingness to commit himself to one view of the past, of the Thirty Years' War, of reality. Döblin does not commit us to his one interpretation of history. Parataxis assumes the same role as irony in Raabe's Else von der Tanne: it leaves the way for the author to stand away and reject what he has told us, without losing the informational content. The author who is aware that every factual statemnt is in a sense a lie is thus not enjoined to silence, since his mode of narration communicates that he has this awareness and will not defend one view of the world as the only possible view of the world.

Another characteristic expressionist device displayed by

Döblin's prose is the abrupt transition from one scene to another. Usually, the breaks between the sections mark such a transition. This does not necessarily make it easier for the reader to cope with the shift, since there need be no logical connection between one passage and the next, so that the indices which locate the new scene must be found and deciphered. Thus, after a discussion beween Ferdinand and the Jesuit Lamormain, the subsequent section begins with a completely different scene: "Durch den Wind und die graue Nässe schwankte die schwere massige Gestalt des Mannes unter dem viereckigen Hut." (I, 117) Only clues like the four-cornered hat and the later reference to the "old Jesuit father" hint that this rider is Lamormain, and one is not sure of this fact for another two pages. One result of such breaks is that boredom does not set in, since one is repeatedly being challenged to analyze what is happening in order to comprehend it. Another is that the fragmentation of the text into disconnected scenes prevents the illusion that the flow of events is even, continuous and necessary and encourages the reader to participate in the reconstruction of the past by bridging the gaps himself.

Occasionally, it is difficult to build such a bridge, since the jump is not simply from one scene to another, but from reality to phantasy. One instance is the strange story about a nobleman who, as a prank, once barricaded the door of a little church in order to wait for the reaction when a procession tried to enter the building. As he and two companions watch, the procession approaches and the sealed door springs open. Terrified, the three go towards the procession and suddenly realize that they have been

turned into dogs:

> Der Edelmann lief beiseite, stiess einen Schrei aus, aber zu seinem Entsetzen fuhr ein greuliches Gebrüll aus seiner Kehle. Als er sich umdrehte nach seinen Freunden, liefen da zwei starke Bulldoggen; er selbst wedelte mit dem Schwanz, war ein rippendürrer brauner Fleischerhund, der sich die Brust begeiferte. An einem Galgen unweit des Orts hat man später die drei Hunde erschlagen und eingeschart. (I, 15)

Told at the same narrative level, in the same voice, as everything else, this abrupt excursion into phantasy is bewildering. One might explain it as Döblin's attempt to convey to us how the people of the seventeenth century perceived the world as a mixture of what we consider reality and superstitious phantasy. However, it is also possible that Döblin is challenging the twentieth century rationalism which refuses to grant validity to what it considers inexplicable.

The same quality of irrationality marks the portrait of Ferdinand drawn by Döblin. Originally the novel was to have borne the title Ferdinand und der andere, and despite the fact that lengthy sections are dominated by other characters such as Maximilian of Bavaria and Wallenstein, Ferdinand still looms large over the whole. He is the centre of the opening and the closing scenes, but more than that, he is at the centre of the entity known as the Empire. If Döblin owes a debt to Schiller's Wallenstein, it is in the idea that there can be a correspondence between an individual personality and the larger community. Perhaps Döblin was not consciously imitative of Schiller's depiction of the army as a reflection of Wallenstein's will, but he could not have been unaware of it, and in the novel the Empire

and the war are reflections of Ferdinand's complex and enigmatic character. Ferdinand is a mixture of contradictions--piety and cupidity, brutality and meekness, incompetence and machiavellism--and so are the subjects under him. The Empire has not been forged by Ferdinand's will in the way that Schiller's Wallenstein shaped the army, but his madness is exemplary for it.

The personality of Ferdinand is presented in a series of vignettes. The first, the banquet, has already been discussed as showing his greed. A hunting expedition exposes Ferdinand's religious faith, his helplessness and also his power. Riding through the forest, he is thrown from his horse, which he takes as a warning sign from heaven:

> Es hat mich bald erwischt. Ich muss beten. Ich muss beten . . . . Es hat eines Zeichens bedurft. Ich habe es nicht erwartet. (I, 23)

This is the first mention of the religious doubts and fears which haunt Ferdinand and will do so until shortly before his death. An abduction attempt shortly after this fall demonstrates Ferdinand's impotence. Although he is the Emperor, in his actual person he is weak, and can do little more than shout at the abductor Paar:

> Hund, Bestie, hab' ich dir befohlen, mich hierher zu bringen. Schalk du, ich metzle dich nieder auf der Stelle. Wo hast du mich verschleppt? Was soll ich, was willst du mit mir? (I, 26)

The plot, if it is a plot, does not succeed, but it has shown that as an individual, Ferdinand is powerless. Whence does his authority come then? Primarily from his rank, his office as

Emperor. No matter how silly Ferdinand's conduct and behaviour become, the fact that he is Emperor makes people ignore such things. The compulsion to maintain the prestige of the Emperor is so great that the nobles would sooner go to war again than see Ferdinand embarassed. The Emperor has promised to give Maximilian the Upper Palatinate, and the nobles are forced to support his decision. To do otherwise would be to weaken the Emperor and their own position:

> Vor allem: wir wissen nicht, was den hohen Herrn veranlasst hat wider seinen Willen der Durchlaucht in Bayern nachzugeben. Wir wissen es nicht. Es heisst auf der Hut sein vor der Durchlaucht. Es heisst, sich ergeben und entschlossen vor den Kaiser stellen. (I, 85)

Inexorably, the combination of ignorance and weakness struggling to retain authority forces a continuation of a war that is not wanted and cannot be afforded. Döblin's is a pessimistic view of politics: these decisions are not made by rational men seeking to achieve rational ends, but by ill-informed self-seeking individuals trying to preserve the status quo, and their ranks. There is no hint of the idealism or of the evolution to freedom which marked Schiller's treatment of the Thirty Years' War here.

The absurdity of this government is intensified as Döblin gives the reader reason to believe that Ferdinand is mad. One day, the Emperor joins the court fool in the cellar, where both become drunk. In his intoxicated stupor, Ferdinand skins a cat alive and drapes himself in the poor creature's fur. When the courtiers find the Emperor, he is babbling senselessly:

> Alles hat er gefressen. Er ist schlecht.

> Es ist kein Gelehrter. Er ist ein Siebenfrass, ein unbarmherziger. Mich lässt er verrecken. Fangt ihn doch. Den unbarmherzigen Schelm. Gottseibeiuns. (I, 100)

The brutal senselessness of the cellar incident is frightening and sickening proof of the sadistic violence of which members of this society are capable. It is also a sign that the Empire is not rationally directed from the centre, that there is no centre.

Döblin's portrayals of other historical figures are equally unflattering. Maximilian of Bavaria is a dour religious fanatic who is ruthless in his quest for power. Frederick is a dandy who breaks down in drunken weeping in a conference with his generals, and then spends his time at hunts and balls. Christian of Brunswick is an illiterate boor who is as fanatic but not as bright as Maximilian. Wallenstein appears as a corrupt businessman exploiting the war for his own profit.[15]

Part of Döblin's demythologization of the image of the Thirty Years' War lies in his portrayal of the violence of the war. He uses the standard catalogue of the destructive effects of the war--killing, torture, cannibalism and plague--but imbues them with such seemingly realistic detail that the traditional lists pale by comparison. Döblin avoids figurative language; his cold, precise, scientific account achieves much greater verisimilitude. Thus, he does not allude to the plagues which killed so many of the population, but instead gives a scientific report on how the fevers were spread by mosquitoes, beginning with their life cycle in the swamps:

> Unter der schilfdurchstochenen Oberfläche der Wasser, dicht am Spiegel, hingen die Millionen Larven wie herrenlose Naturtrümmer, gleichmässig Luft saugend durch ihre kleinen Atemröhren. Dick schwoll ihr Kopf an, hob sich über den Spiegel, die Schale zitterte, knisterte, spannte sich, riss über der Schläfe, seitlich; langsam drängte sich das lange junge Gebilde durch, engangelegt Fühler Glieder Flügel, rastete sich spreizend, auf einem Blatt der Wasserlinse, hing flügelspannend grossbeinig an einer Schilfscheide. (I, 109)

This is not the usual kind of information in historical literature, but it is effective: this biological process is verifiable today and ties the book firmly to "reality." In the same way, the symptoms of the plagues which Döblin itemizes could be checked. The incontrovertible truth of such factuality is overwhelming, and lends an aspect of truth to Döblin's accounts of slaughter and torture. By comparison, the battle descriptions seem to lack detail. The Battle of Lützen, for example, takes only two sentences. What Döblin does stress is the only aspect of the battles which is at all factually probable, the noise and smoke of the large artillery pieces. Like Grimmelshausen, he does not try to describe the essentially formless battle itself, and also like Grimmelshausen he communicates the effect of the battle by focussing on the death which it causes. He avoids, however, the carefully balanced rhetorical account of corpses scattered on the ground, showing instead the one decaying corpse of Gustavus Adolphus before its burial, wherein there is a sufficient indictment of the futility of war.

After the starkness of such passages, and the steady effort to create a factual and plausible history, the conclusion of

this novel is all the more inexplicable. What are we to conclude about Ferdinand's death at the hands of the hairy dwarf in the forest? Having carefully based himself on the facts as they were available to him and having succeeded in allowing more historical insight than many history books might, Döblin confuses us with this total departure from documented history and from "reality." Perhaps the best explanation for this is that despite his tremendous effort, Döblin was not satisfied that Wallenstein is more truthful than other historical literature, and that in this sudden reversal he is preventing the reader from accepting his portrayal. This would seem to be consistent with Ferdinand's words that everything runs by itself anyway, and that to be able to state something as known is still not much help to man in the face of things: "Was willst du? Es ist ja alles wahr, was du sagst. Ich möchte es so gern glauben. Es hilft aber nichts." (II, 462) This nihilistic despair at the futility of making statements, of analyzing and understanding, is what differentiates Döblin's treatment of the Thirty Years' War from that of his contemporary, Bertolt Brecht. Both saw a connection between war in the seventeenth century and in the twentieth, both opposed the naive faith in recorded and received history, and both considered the practice of war to be the extension of selfishness, but Brecht understood his role to be one of inciting people to act, not only one of observing and reporting.

Notes to Chapter V

[1] "Über meinen Lehrer Döblin," Akzente, 14 (1967), 309.

[2] "Döblins Wallenstein und die Geschichte," Zur deutschen Literatur seit der Jahrhundertwende (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1967), p. 228.

[3] Quoted in Theodore Ziolkowski, Dimensions of the Modern Novel. German Texts and European Contexts (Princetion: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 106.

[4] Quoted in Viktor Žmegač, "Alfred Döblins Poetik des Romans," Deutsche Romantheorien, ed. Reinhold Grimm (Frankfurt a.M.: Athenäum, 1968), p. 303.

[5] Alfred Döblin, "Von Leben und Tod, die es beide nicht gibt. Aus nachgelassenen Diktaten," Sinn und Form, 9 (1957), 918.

[6] For a discussion of the use of facts in Berlin Alexanderplatz, see Theodore Ziolkowski, Dimensions of the Modern Novel. German Texts and European Contexts, pp. 99-137.

[7] Alfred Döblin, "Schriftstellerei und Dichtung," Jahrbuch der Sektion für Dichtkunst, Preussische Akademie der Künste (Berlin: S. Fischer, 1929), p. 75.

[8] Quoted in Žmegač, "Alfred Döblins Poetik des Romans," Deutsche Romantheorien, p. 318.

[9] ibid.

[10] ibid.

[11] Robert R. Palmer and Joel Colton, A History of the Modern World (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), p. 123.

[12] Alfred Döblin, Wallenstein, 2 vols., (Berlin: S. Fischer, 1920), I, 9. Subsequent references to the text from this edition shall be given in parentheses after the quotation.

[13] "Alfred Döblins Werk 1928," Gedichte und Prosa Vol. II: Die Schriften (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1958), 585.

[14] Palmer and Colton, A History of the Modern World, p. 123.

[15] Compare With Grass, Akzente, 14, 297-299.

CHAPTER VI

BRECHT'S MUTTER COURAGE UND IHRE KINDER

Bertolt Brecht's play Mutter Courage, written between 1938 and 1939, both culminated and also negated the tradition of the literary portrayal of the Thirty Years' War. Brecht must have been well aware of his precursors. The influence of one of Grimmelshausen's writings, the seventh book of the Simplicianische Schriften, as a source for the structure and substance of Mutter Courage, is readily obvious.[1] What is not quite as apparent on the surface is that in his own way and from a totally different direction Brecht came very close to Grimmelshausen's attitude to war and to Grimmelshausen's method of criticizing war through a literary work. A further influence must have been Schiller's Wallenstein trilogy. Unfortunately, Gudrun Schulz does not discuss their respective treatments of the Thirty Years' War in her examination of the long and troubled intellectual relationship of Brecht to Schiller, probably because Brecht did not actually rework Schiller's drama in the way that he reworked other plays for his own purposes.[2] However, this is a major omission. The very fact that Brecht did not choose to rework the Wallenstein trilogy is revealing. Certainly he could not have been unfamiliar with it, since he was an avid if criticial reader of Schiller, and just as certainly he could not have agreed with Schiller's portrayal of the war any more than he accepted Schiller's presentation of the concept of freedom in Don Carlos.[3] Indeed, one can feel something of the quality of Wallensteins Lager in Mutter Courage.

But there is a shift of emphasis from Schiller to Brecht, with the latter focussing on the anonymous commoner at the bottom instead of the central hero at the top as the maker of history. This redistribution of emphasis is only one of the differences between Brecht's and Schiller's respective approaches to the Thirty Years' War. Brecht could not have used the Wallenstein trilogy as the basis for his drama because within the context of his view of history and of drama, the Schillerian reduction of the war to a personal tragedy was wrong.

There is probably no need to point out that Brecht was firmly opposed to war, only to remind that his criticism was expounded Marxist terms even if its origins were a personal humanism reacting against the horror of World War I.[4] Essential to the Marxist critique of war was the thesis that war was a necessary manifestation of capitalist processes and the Leninist elaboration thereof that world war was the inevitable outcome of imperialism, i.e. capitalist competition for world markets.[5] Brecht had already grappled with some of the problems of presenting Marxist analyses of the functionings of capitalism, especially in Die Heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe.[6] If making the stock market comprehensible to an audience had been a dramatic challenge, presenting an analysis of war on the stage was even more so. Confronted by the same problem of how to deal with modern war literarily, Karl Kraus had produced the colossal Die letzten Tage der Menschheit, which attempted to present World War I in its entirety, but such an unwieldy work was alien to Brecht's dramaturgy. Rather than attempting to bring the entire war on the stage, Brecht selected a histor-

ical framework--that of the Thirty Years' War--and interpreted it for the audience in terms relevant to the 1930's. Mutter Courage is the story of Anna Fierling, who follows the army as a sutler with her family. She is trying to find a compromise with the war in order to make a living for herself and her family, but she fails and loses all of her three children to the war.

Mutter Courage is not, as some people have felt, a historical drama, i.e. a drama set in the past, but rather a drama about history, about the ways of seeing the Thirty Years' War and, by extension, all war. It is not a difficult play; none of Brecht's dramas are difficult in the way that an absurd piece might be. In comparison with Döblin's Wallenstein, the treatment of the Thirty Years' War might even appear simplistic. What is difficult for us is going beyond Brecht himself in the interpretation of Brecht. There is a great amount of material available now by Brecht, commenting on his work, his theory of the drama, and himself, and this tends to colour too strongly the writings on him. It is easier to accept Brecht's remarks on Mutter Courage at face value and as the end of interpretation, but in the long run it is not as critically satisfying. This is not to say that such remarks ought to be ignored, only that they should not be considered definitive and need not be the final goal of analysis. By examining Mutter Courage against the background of other presentations of the Thirty Years' War, it becomes clear that Brecht has done more than his self-commentaries would indicate. Certainly the play is a statement about war, but it is also, perhaps haplessly or unwittingly, a challenge to the Marxist philosophy of history,

one which brought Brecht dangerously close to ideological heresy.

Unless one remembers the difference between a historical drama and a drama about history, it is difficult to make sense of Brecht and especially of Mutter Courage. It is pointless to expect anything of Brecht that would have been inconsistent with his theoretical position and hence his intentions, but this is unfortunately done by some critics. In a recent work on Brecht's "second optimism," John Milfull complains that Brecht failed to include utopian visions of the future in Mutter Courage, a point which certain Marxist critics had long since raised against this play.[7] Milfull goes on to argue that the strictures of internal dramatic structure and the historical conditions obtaining at the time of Brecht's writing precluded such a vision, and questions the validity of Mutter Courage as a "Marxist" play:

> . . . the play itself seems not only to fail to produce such an alternative, it seems actually to discount the possibility of one, by its failure to include the 'ground for optimism.' We have seen that such an alternative is ruled out both by the actual historical setting of the play and by the contingencies of the time at which it was originally written. There seems, however, to be an even more basic problem involved--the whole problem of writing a 'historical' play which deals with pre-Marxist times and yet implies a 'Marxist' conclusion.[8]

It seems that Milfull is setting up nine-pins in order to be able to knock them down with a loud noise. It is not really fair to berate Brecht for not presenting a vision of a better world, since Brecht would have been the last one to try to do that. What he was interested in demonstrating was how individuals conscious of their situations could alter those situations. For those in a

capitalist world, Marxism could be a source of insight into the process of the system which is distinguished by exploitation. What Milfull misses is actually present in Brecht's plays: the "alternative" is the implicit post-capitalist system that will come into being if the audience learns from the play and acts, and the "optimism" is the conviction that by alerting people to their historical situation, they will be persuaded to act so as to realize that alternative.[9]

It is this task of alerting, of awakening, of stimulating to action which Brecht undertook in his plays. Central to Brecht's dramaturgy was the idea of the Verfremdungseffekt, the "effect of alienation" whereby neither the audience nor the actors would identify with the characters in the play for the release of catharsis, but would remain dispassionate observers, never forgetting that the play was merely a play. Drama for Brecht was didactic: it would show the audience something about the world instead of attempting to reproduce the world on the stage. Given this theoretical foundation, it is clear why Milfull's statement that the writing of a play which was Marxist and which was set in some historical framework was a problem for Brecht is ill-founded. Of course, it would have been silly for Brecht to try to put Marxist ideas and slogans into the mouths of characters living two centuries before Marx and then to pretend that he had produced a "realistic" historical play. It would be intolerable art for any dramatist to act "as if" a character in 1630 could have anticipated Marxist analyses of war. But Brecht was far from committing such blunders, and Mutter Courage does not read as a travesty of

history. Brecht did not attempt to re-create a historical setting on the stage, but instead strove to comment on the audience's present by casting that present into a different frame. The "realism" of a play such as Mutter Courage lies not in any attempted depiction of the Thirty Years' War, but in the destruction of illusions. Again, Brecht has left us a self-interpretation on this point. In his Arbeitsjournal, he raised the question of why and how Courage is a realistic work. Each of the four reasons he cites underscores that the play is directed first and foremost to the audience's own present: "das werk arbeitet mit dem gegenwärtigem bewusstsein der mehrheit der menschen."[10]

The Thirty Years' War as such is of little interest to Brecht except insofar as it provides a context for dissecting the problem of war. As Eric Bentley indicated, the Thirty Years' War was especially suitable for this purpose because of its traditional, almost symbolic significance in Germany: "Why the Thirty Years' War? Because in German history it is the locus classicus of death--the death, not of individuals, but of cities and populations."[11] Hopefully this thesis will have provided some support for Bentley's assertion that the Thirty Years' War had acquired an image for Germans. What is different about Brecht is that he not only offers his own interpretation of that image, but casts doubt upon the very process of image construction.

The technique employed by Brecht for that purpose is more complex than simply assuming a different viewpoint, showing a "worm's eye view," as Keith Dickson would have it.[12] Much in the same way that Grimmelshausen did in Simplicissimus, Brecht uses

a kind of multi-perspectivism, presenting different individuals' images of the war. It is not immediately apparent how certain of the images of the Thirty Years' War are presented and activated by Brecht. For example, there is a tendency to ignore the corollary to the claim that Brecht presents a "view from below" of the Thirty Years' War. In order to have such a contrast be effective, there must also be a "view from above." This other view of the Thirty Years' War is implicit as the one that the audience brings to the theatre and is explicit in the sub-titles which precede each scene. Of course, each of the character embodies an attitude to the war and acts accordingly. Then, the songs offer further commentary on the play and the characters. None of these loci, though, mark Brecht's own position; his critical negative stance becomes discernible only through the import of the whole.

The slogans which introduce the acts are an integral and essential component of the drama. They provide the chronological information which ties the various scenes together. They might be compared to the voice of an unseen commentator cutting in on a film and also remind one of war bulletins. By simply labelling the various scenes with dates, Brecht avoids giving the impression that there is a pattern to the chronology of the war. The play opens in 1624 and ends in 1636, reinforcing the idea that it is not congruent with the war and that the war is open-ended. The suggestion that the war will go on indefinitely is made distinct in the last of the headline banners: "Der Krieg ist noch lange nicht zu Ende."[13] Brecht does more than provide chronology in the headlines, though. In many of the slogans he gives information

on the historical events and ironically hints at alternate meanings of the same events, meanings which participants might perceive rather than observers. Brecht's subtley and suggestiveness in dealing with the "facts" of the war reminds one of Raabe. Thus, in the first slogan, we are told that Oxenstjern is assembling recruits for the campaign to Poland. This is a simple, bland factual statement: it gives information which seems to explain the proceedings. But does it? Upon closer examination, it is obvious that as an explanation it is sadly deficient, for the viewer does not know from this line any of the reasons why. Why is Oxenstjern gathering recruits, and why in Dalarne? Why is he the commander? Why is there to be an expedition to Poland? The uncritical acceptance of the reported "fact" as explanation is a usual response, but it is not sufficient if one wishes to become the subject and not the object of the social processes. The audience which does not raise its eyebrows sceptically at this "fact" is in the same situation as Mother Courage, who never doubts the "facts" upon which she acts.

In the slogans Brecht also encourages a reinterpretation of the Thirty Years' War by juxtaposing the "important" historical events with what might be considered trivial personal incidents. The halting of the Swedish army before a fortress in the second scene could have some larger sginficance in the course of the war; for Mother Courage it is where she finds her son again, and where she sells a capon. The use of adjectives disporoportionate to the situation throws an ironical light on them, for they are not the descriptors Brecht would apply, but those that the partici-

pants themselves might use. The sale of the capon is "fortunate," and the "bold," "upright" son enjoys "great" days, until his death. The effect of such ironical contrasts is especially bitter in the heading to the fifth act, where we are told: "1631 Tillys Sieg bei Magdeburg kostet Mutter Courage vier Offiziershemden." (p. 61) Magdeburg is one of the catchwords of the Thirty Years' War, symbolizing all the horror of destruction and death. Brecht introduces two jarring notes when bringing up this catchword: he reminds us that the destruction of Magdeburg was considered a victory by one side, and reduces it to the loss of four shirts by Mother Courage.

The headlines allowed Brecht to mention the death of commanders like Tilly and Gustavus Adolphus without interrupting the conduct of business as usual by Mother Courage. For the small man, the passing of a great general is not central to his life, but occurs on the periphery. In addition, the device of the headlines made it possible for Brecht to allude to the image of the Thirty Years' War as a grim period of destruction. It would not have been possible to depict on the stage the content of the opening to the ninth scene, for example:

> Schon sechzehn Jahre dauert nun der grosse Glaubenskrieg. Über die Hälfte seiner Bewohner hat Deutschland eingebüsst. Gewaltige Seuchen töten was die Metzeleien übriggelassen haben. In den ehemals blühenden Landstrichen wütet der Hunger. Wölfe durchstreifen die niedergebrannten Städte. (p. 90)

Written in a curt, telegraphic style, this report lists the usual elements of the image of the destructive fury of the Thirty Years' War. Why did Brecht suddenly stress this aspect of the war? It

is likely that he wanted to emphasize the great discrepancy between the actuality of violence and death and the way Mother Courage continues to perceive events. For, although the fact that no one can hope to benefit from the war should be obvious, Mother Courage doggedly refuses to give up her business, maintaining: "In dem Krieg is noch allerhand für uns drin." (p. 96)

But Mother Courage is by no means alone in her conviction that it is possible to benefit from the war. From the beginning of the play, Brecht portrays characters who look to the war for some gain. For the two soldiers in the opening scene, the war has those virtues normally attributed to times of peace. Their conversation reveals a strange inversion of values: the war brings good and peace bodes ill. The recruiting officer complains that all honour has withered away because of the prolonged peace: "Da gibts kein Manneswort, kein Treu und Glauben, kein Ehrgefühl." (p. 7) The sergeant agrees that it is the long, uninterrupted peace which is to be blamed for this deplorable state of affairs:

> Man merkts, hier ist zu lang kein Krieg gewesen. Wo soll da Moral herkommen, frag ich? Frieden, das ist nur Schlamperei, erst der Krieg schafft Ordnung. (p. 7)

To the military mind, it is peace which is chaotic and formless, and war which is neat and tidy. Furthermore, the warmakers realize that this attitude can be taught to the general population. The inital fear and dismay at the prospect of war can be overcome, especially once people have a personal stake in the war:

> Wie alles Gute ist auch der Krieg am Anfang halt

> schwer zu machen. Wenn er dann erst floriert, ist er auch zäh; dann schrecken die Leut zurück vom Frieden, wie die Würfler vorm Aufhören, weil dann müssens zahlen, was sie verloren haben. (p. 8)

In two sentences, Brecht has summed up the problem of war: once people overcome their initial trepidations, they become inured to war and are unwilling to see it end. The war acquires thereby a force and independence which gives it its own momentum: the war flourishes, the war is tough. It is interesting to note in passing the difference between Brecht's use of the reference to gambling and Droste-Hülshoff's. Where she employed the throw of the dice metaphorically to communicate the element of chance in military conflict, Brecht focusses on the psychology of the gambler for whom the game becomes an end in itself and an escape from reality.

Although the soldiers favour one aspect of war, they also display calm acceptance of the fact that war involves death. War, the sergeant tells Mother Courage, cannot survive without troops: " . . . wie soll Krieg sein, wenn es keine Soldaten gibt?" (p. 13) People may benefit for a time from the war, but eventually the war will want something in return: "So, den Butzen soll dein Krieg fressen, und die Birne soll er ausspucken! . . . Er kann schauen, wie er zu seine Sach kommt, wie?" (pp. 13-14) Brecht has added a new and more odious metaphor to the catalogue of metaphors for war. The war is not a storm or a fire, but a kind of gruesome businessman who devours men after supporting them. The soldiers are honest enough to recognize that in dealing with this merchant one cannot profit in the long run. Even the bombastic sergeant is unsettled by the thought of death, and reveals that he is

actually a coward who keeps to the rear of the action: "Immer halt ich mich dahint. Einen sicheren Platz, als wenn du Feldwebel bist, gibts nicht. Da kannst du die andern vorschicken, dass sie sich Ruhm erwerben." (p. 18) Once again Brecht is mocking the militarists, who advocate war and glorify it as an opportunity to become a hero while they themselves refuse to go to the front lines.

The hypocrisy of command is further emphasized in the figure of the Feldhauptmann. He praises Mother Courage's son and promises him booty once the city is taken, as he has probably promised every soldier some gain:

> . . . du hast eine Heldentat vollbracht, als frommer Streiter, und für Gott getan, was du getan hast, in einem Glaubenskrieg, das rechne ich dire besonders hoch an, mit einer goldenen Armspang, sobald ich die Stadt hab. (p. 22)

He reneges upon this promise, we learn later. Once the city has been taken, a soldier complains that the army was not allowed to plunder and loot: "Der Feldhauptmann hat uns beschissen und die Stadt nur für eine Stunde zum Plündern freigegeben." (p. 61) The soldier places no value in the very pious declarations of the commander and interprets his "mercy" as a sign that the city has bribed him. The commander's end is fittingly ignoble. Ostensibly riding back from the fight for reinforcements, he lost his way in the fog and ended up in the battle by mistake, where he was killed. (p. 64)

In spite of her efforts to dissuade them and to hold them back from participation in the war, both of Mother Courage's sons succumb to the militarist viewpoints. Eilif is excited by the

prospect of doing heroic deeds. Much like Simplicissimus at his height of fame as the Huntsman of Soest, Eilif forgets his peasant origins and boasts of success in deceiving the farmers and stealing their oxen:

> Ich biet fünfzehn. Als wollt ich zahlen. Sie sind verdutzt und kratzen sich die Köpf. Sofort buck ich mich nach meinem Eisen und hau sie zusammen. Not kennt kein Gebot, nicht? (p. 24)

The commander praises him for this prowess in theft, but Mother Courage reacts quite differently: she gives him a cuff and scolds him for not surrendering when he had the chance. For her, the concept of honour is nebulous and empty when considered against the chance of getting killed. However, Eilif does not heed her advice. Several scenes later, we see him again, when his fortunes have been reversed. He has been taken prisoner for breaking into a peasant dwelling during the brief interlude of peace. Eilif does not understand why the mere formal transition from war to peace should transform previously honourable deeds into crimes, pleading naively: "Ich hab nix andres gemacht als vorher auch." (p. 87) The preacher makes the folly in this shift from right to wrong explicit: "Im Krieg haben sie ihn dafür geehrt, zur Rechten vom Feldhauptmann ist er gesessen. Da wars Kühnheit!" (p. 87) The deed is the same, but the social context gives it its meaning as either a crime or an act of heroism. There is, remarks one of the soldiers, nothing honourable in stealing cows, reminding one of Simplicissimus' account of the destruction of his home given to the hermit. After Eilif has been led away, Mother Courage returns with the news that the peace is over. She is correct in her

assertion that war did not take her son, but only technically, for the confusion of war has deprived all value systems of meaning.

The other son, Schweizerkas, also falls victim to the war because of his attitude to military matters. As regimental paymaster, he has been entrusted with the money chest. When the enemy suddenly attacks, he refuses to abandon the chest which has been placed in his care, ignoring Mother Courage's admonition: "Es hat sich ausgezahlmeistert." (p. 38) He feels that it would be a contravention of his duties to part with the chest. His major concern is not for himself and his well-being, but for the army, for without money the mercenary soldiers will not obey commands. Like Eilif, he cannot see the implications of his role as a soldier: his desire to simply do his duty is essential for the continuation of the war effort. When he is captured, he chooses to die in the line of duty. His death neither hampers the war effort nor advances the victory, and it brings him no recognition as a hero. Instead, he dies nameless and unknown even to his immediate family.

By far the most complex attitude, or mixture of attitudes, towards the war is displayed by Mother Courage. One is drawn to her as a character--audiences at the first performances of the play angered Brecht by identifying with her and her sufferings. Hugh F. Garten has succinctly summarized the positive elements of her character:

> With her blend of cunning, impudence, common sense, and maternal instinct, Mother Courage is perhaps the

> most real character Brecht has created. She propagates no doctrines, but by her very nature epitomizes the sufferings of the nameless masses in the cataclysm of war.[14]

However, this should not blind us to the fact that she is a static character who does not evolve, who does not change, who leaves the stage sadder but not wiser. Her attitude to the war is basically an unwavering one, albeit not naive or simplistic. She has more insight than the soldiers or her sons into the nature of war, but does not possess the breadth of vision or depth of understanding to be able to grasp her own role in the war. As Brecht observed, she had had the opportunity to see, but did not make use of it:

> Die Courage . . . erkennt zusammen mit ihren Freunden und Gästen und nahezu jedermann das rein merkantile Wesen des Krieges: das ist gerade, was sie anzieht. Sie glaubt an den Krieg bis zuletzt. Es geht ihr nicht einmal auf, dass man eine grosse Schere haben muss, um am Krieg seinen Schnitt zu machen.[15]

Brecht was upset because audiences tended to misinterpret Mother Courage, and thus missed the point of the play, namely that there is a causal relationship between Mother Courage's suffering and her business dealings. As late as 1953, Brecht noted in his Arbeitsjournal that even socialists saw the drama as "pacifist" and overlooked the negative side to Mother Courage's war experiences:

> historisch betrachtet zeigt das stück die erlebnisse einer kleinen händlerin, die im krieg geschäfte machen will und alles verliert. der krieg trifft sie keineswegs als blindes schicksal, sondern sie erkennt ihn als die profitablen machen-

> schaften der grossen; an ihnen will sie sich beteiligen.[16]

The crucial difference between the concept of war held by Droste-Hülshoff, Meyer, Stifter, and Raabe and that of Brecht is embodied in the latter's refusal to see the war as "fate" or as an inexorable force to which the individual is subjected. However, in the drama, the characters are still not on Brecht's own level of analysis. Mother Courage attempts to cope with the war, attempts to mediate between the destructive and the possibly constructive aspects of war, but cannot bring them to a synthesis because they are mutually exclusive. She can do little more than alternate from one side to the other, now criticizing the war, now praising it as the source of her well-being.

From the first, Mother Courage identifies herself with the commercial side of the war. When challenged by the sergeant as to her identity, she replies that she and her family are business people, "Geschäftsleut." (p. 8) She recounts the history of her involvement with the Thirty Years' War in terms of trade items, such as the resuce of "fünfzig Brotlaib" at Riga or the purchase of a horse. She is coldly practical about her function as a camp follower. She is there to do business by selling victuals and goods to the troops:

> Ihr Hauptleut, eure Leut marschieren
> Euch ohne Wurst nicht in den Tod.
> Lasst die Courage sie erst kurieren
> Mit Wein von Leibs- und Geistesnot.
> Kanonen auf die leeren Mägen
> Ihr Hauptleut, das ist nicht gesund. (p. 9)

Like the soldiers, Mother Courage must therefore see the wartime

as a period of prosperity. She benefits most from the hardship of others. The siege is an excellent opportunity for her to make better profits, for then both those within and without the walls are hungry: "Sie sind ruiniert, das ist, was sie sind. Sie nagen am Hungertuch . . . . Und ich habe einen Kapaun und soll ihn für vierzig Heller ablassen." (p. 21) Her participation in the war does not stop there, for she also deals in ammunition. Although sarcastic about the way the quartermaster sells his regiment's bullets, she buys them nevertheless and sells them for a good profit to the next regiment so that they can continue fighting.

The highpoint of her efforts to profit from the war, and her moral nadir, must be the incident with the shirts at the siege of Magdeburg. When asked for bandage material, she refuses to give anything away for free: "Ich gib nix, ich mag nicht, ich muss an mich selber denken." (p. 62) The involvement in business has hardened her so much that she places gain ahead of fellow-feeling. The disastrous consequences of such a greed are brought home to her, though, when she haggles too long and Schweizerkas loses his life as a result. But neither this nor the general impoverishment of the army persuade her to give up her business. The brief interlude of peace she deplores because it spells her financial ruin, since she has invested so heavily in war. Despite the misery of winter, Mother Courage cannot reject her way of life, cannot give up her wagon: "Ich trenn mich noch nicht vom Wagen, wo ich gewohnt bin, wegen dir ists gar nicht, es ist wegen dem Wagen." (p. 97) Alone and tired, she moves on at the end of the play, resolving against despair to continue as before.

The remarkable thing about Mother Courage is that, with the possible exception of the preacher, no one is as critical of the war and of the army. She is loathe to let her sons become soldiers, and struggles to prevent Kattrin from any involvement with soldiers. Neither honour nor hero-worship mean anything to her. She feels that commanders who stress heroism are incompetents who require herculean efforts on the part of their men to compensate for tactical errors:

> Wenn ein Feldhauptmann oder König recht dumm ist
> und er führt seine Leut in die Scheissgass, dann
> brauchts Todesmut bei den Leuten, auch eine Tugend.
> Wenn er zu geizig ist und zuwenig Soldaten anwirbt,
> dann müssen sie lauter Herkulesse sein. (p. 25)

She also does not accept that the commanders and generals are motivated by noble ideals such as patriotism and religious faith. Looking closely, one can see, she claims, that they are in the war for private gain: "Aber wenn man genauer hinsieht, sinds nicht so blöd, sondern führn die Krieg für Gewinn." (p. 36) One might feel that this reduction of motives to one, greed, is too extreme, especially with the contrasting complexity of Schiller's Wallenstein. However, Brecht and Schiller may be closer here than one might expect, for it can be argued that after all the possible reasons for Wallenstein's actions have been brought to a common denominator, that denominator will be his personal ambition. And certainly Döblin's Wallenstein would be consistent with Mother Courage's (Brecht's) judgement.

Mother Courage questions not only the motives of the commanders but also the historical interpretation of the events of the

war. Words like "victory," "defeat," and "momentcus event" embody value judgements about history, and are relative. What is considered a triumph by one side--and one historian--is a disastrous defeat for the other side. Furthermore, the participants in the event need not by any means accept the value judgement put upon the event. The preacher says resignedly that they have been conquered, but Mother Courage challenges the meaning of his assertion:

> Wer ist besiegt? Die Sieg und Niederlagen der Grosskopfigen oben und der von unten fallen nämlich nicht immer zusammen, durchaus nicht. Es gibt sogar Fälle, wo die Niederlag für die Untern eigentlich ein Gewinn ist für sie. (p. 40)

Historical events are significant only insofar as they mark some immediate personal change. The death of Tilly is described as a "historical moment," but Mother Courage responds that the moment is historical for her only because Kattrin has been hurt.

It is not out of character for him that the preacher is the one to mouthe the cliché about "historical moments." Against the worldly Mother Courage, the preacher appears naive and ineffectual. He seems incapable of original thought and relies on truisms as moral precepts. Without a consistent system of values, he cannot effectively criticize the war or disassociate himself from it. We meet him in the commander's camp, excusing violent deeds by cloaking them in parables. When Eilif reports the theft of the cattle and claims that the act was justified because it was necessary, the preacher waffles and then finds a way to accept this crime:

> Strenggenommen, in der Bibel steht der Satz nicht, aber unser Herr hat aus fünf Broten fünfhundert herzaubern können, da war eben keine Not, und da konnt er auch verlangen, dass man seinen Nächsten liebt, denn man war satt. Heutzutage ist das anders. (p. 24)

With such logic, or lack of it, one could excuse anything. But although he fails to criticize the war as one might expect a preacher to do, he does make some comments which are nevertheless negative. Thus, when Mother Courage is worrying that the war will come to an end, he reassures her that there is no danger of that. At worst, it might pause briefly:

> Es kann natürlich zu einer kleinen Paus kommen. Der Krieg kann sich veeschnaufen müssen, ja, er kann sogar sozusagen verunglücken. Davor ist er nicht gesichert, es gibt ja nix Vollkommenes allhier auf Erden. (p. 66)

Should the war seem to be slowing down overmuch, the Emperor and the Pope will doubtless "help him in his need." Common sense has led the preacher to make an observation which his casuistic analyses could never have concluded. The preacher also tries to alleviate some of the suffering of a peasant family at the siege of Magdeburg, indicating that he is not without a measure of kindness. However, on the whole he does not act against the war with any conviction or success.

The only positive act would seem to be Kattrin's self-sacrifice. There is doubtless an element of symbolism in the fact that Kattrin is mute and cannot express her opinions on the war in words, only in deeds, although it is possible to see too much symbolic meaning in her dumbness.[17] Yet even her self-sacrifice is problematical.

It is true that Kattrin's deed is selfless and thus can serve as an example, and one feels that J.P. Stern is basically correct in averring that "the value embodied in that act is not taken back, is not exploded."[18] However, is this value sufficient and is the act enough? The war does not come to a halt--the play continues and Mother Courage goes her way in it--and the killing is perhaps even increased through the fighting which takes place after Kattrin's warning note has been sounded. Kattrin may want to act decisively against the war, but her power is limited and her inability to speak prevents her from persuading others to act.

Yet another critical perspective is provided by the songs. Like the slogans, Brecht employed songs in his dramas not to reinforce the content, but to draw attention to it and to comment upon it. It was in keeping with the principles of the Verfremdungseffekt that the actor should sing about himself, not out of himself.[19] This is the case in the first song performed by Mother Courage, where she refers to herself in the third person: "Mutter Courage, die kommt . . . ." (p. 8) The songs also comment upon the drama as a whole. Eilif's "Lied vom Weib und dem Soldaten" prefigures his own end and emphasizes the futility of war:

> Er verging wie der Rauch, und die Wärme ging auch
> Und es warmten sie nicht seine Taten.
> Ach bitter bereut, wer des Weisen Rat scheut! (p. 27)

In Mutter Courage the moral message of the songs is perhaps more intense than in other Brechtian works.[20] The "Solomon Song" argues that virtues have no place in the world as it is presently constituted. More forceful still is the message of the final song

that the war is endless and useless:

> Mit seinem Glück, seiner Gefahre
> Der Krieg, er zieht sich etwas hin.
> Der Krieg, er dauert hundert Jahre
> Der g'meine Mann hat kein Gewinn. (pp. 107-108)

The word "Gewinn" brings us full circle back to Mother Courage's first song about her business dealings, which have left her ruined and isolated.

The theme of business and war is one of the two things which distinguish Brecht's portrayal of the Thirty Years' War from preceding ones. It was a Marxist principle that war is a manifestation of capitalism, and this is what Brecht has tried to depict on the stage. A comparison with Schiller brings Brecht's achievement into focus. The interpersonal relationships in the Wallenstein trilogy are relationships of power, of responsibility, and of loyalty; the conflicts arise when the balance of power is shifted or challenged. In Mutter Courage, interpersonal relationships are monetary relationships. Mother Courage's "family" remains together because there is a shared source of income. The troops are mercenaries to whom religion and patriotism are nothing; they fight for money and booty. The generals are warmongers in the true sense of the word, since they are out for personal gain. Not only is war an opportunity for business, it is the most ruthless of all business concerns, bankrupting all those who deal with it.

The other thing which distinguishes Brecht is his emphasis on didactic functions of the play. He was not primarily interested in describing the Thirty Years' War, but used it as a framework for his argument. Of course, other treatments of the Thirty

Years' War were also concerned to present the negative aspects of the war, but Brecht wanted to move people to action. People will only act according to the way they see themselves in the world. Because they believe that the war can bring them some gain, Mother Courage, her sons, and the soldiers support the war. They fail to see that in the long run they cannot profit and that only their participation makes the war possible. Brecht's lesson is not only that the Thirty Years' War was terrible, but that there need be no war.

By encouraging people to re-examine their historical situation in order to be able to change it, Brecht left the path of orthodox Marxism. From its first performance in East Germany, Mutter Courage was criticized because Mother Courage does not come to a realization of the true historical situation. This was considered to be too pessimistic and not in line with the concept that didactic socialist literature must end on a positive, optimistic note. In self-defence, Brecht made out Mother Courage's failure to learn lessons from her experience to be a strength of the play, as it is. One cannot agree with Keith A. Dickson's opinion that the Marxists were right to criticize Mother Courage's blindness from the point of view of orthodoxy.[21] Mother Courage's failure to see is consistent with Brecht's intent. However, there is a more serious ideological flaw in Brecht's thought which the discussion about Mother Courage obscured. If the audience did learn from the play to re-examine its situation, to re-organize its view of the world, there is nothing to prevent the same process from being applied to Marxism itself. In other words, Brecht comes

close to the argument of the Soviet writer Evgeny Zamyatin who was exiled by Stalin for maintaining that the dialectical process has no end, that there is no final revolution.[22] However, for our purposes, that Brecht was able to go beyond the bounds of ideology is praiseworthy.

Notes to Chapter VI

1 For a comparison of the two, see Robert L. Hiller and John C. Osborne, "Introduction," to Grimmelshausen's The Runagate Courage, trans. R. L. Hiller and John C. Osborne (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965), pp. 21-27.

2 Die Schillerbearbeitungen Bertolt Brechts. Eine Untersuchung literaturhistorischer Bezüge im Hinblick auf Brechts Traditionsbegriff (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1972). Eric Bentley points to the possibility that Schiller has "an even better claim to be considered the main source" of Mutter Courage than Grimmelshausen, in Eric Bentley, "Introduction: Homage to Bert Brecht," Seven Plays by Bertolt Brecht (New York: Grove Press, 1961), p. xliv.

3 Brecht has left an account of his change in attitude to Don Carlos: "Ich habe den 'Don Carlos,' weiss Gott, je und je geliebt. Aber in diesen Tagen lese ich in Sinclairs 'Sumpf' die Geschichte eines Arbeiters, der in den Schlachthöfen Chicagos zu Tod gehungert wird. Es handelt sich um einfachen Hunger, Kälte, Krankheit, die einen Mann unterkriegen, so sicher, als ob sie von Gott eingesetzt seien. Dieser Mann hat einmal eine kleine Vision von Freiheit, wird dann mit Gummiknüppeln niedergeschlagen. Seine Freiheit hat mit Carlos' Freiheit nicht das mindeste zu tun, ich weiss es: aber ich kann Carlos' Knechtschaft nicht mehr recht ernst nehmen." Schriften zum Theater (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1967), I, 9-10.

4 On Brecht's early reactions to war, especially the First World War, see Reinhard Grimm, "Brechts Anfänge," Aspekte des Expressionismus, Periodisierung-Stil-Gedankenwelt, ed. Wolfgang Paulsen (Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm, 1968), pp. 138-142.

5 On the Marxist theory of war, see Norman H. Gibbs, Thomas W. Wolfe, and Claus D. Kernig, "War," Marxism, Communism and Western Society, A Comparative Encyclopedia (New York: Herder and Herder, 1973), VIII, 307-318.

6 Brecht's aim in Die Heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe was, according to him, to communicate "eine tiefgreifende und zum Handeln ausreichende Erkenntnis der grossen gesellschaftlichen Prozesse unserer Zeit . . . ." Schriften zum Theater, III, 1020.

7 On Brecht's relationship to official Communism, see Martin Esslin, Brecht, the Man and His Work (Garden City: Doubleday, 1960), pp. 157-228, and especially pp. 221-222 for the criticisms of Mutter Courage.

8 From Baal to Keuner. The "Second Optimism" of Bertolt Brecht (Bern: Herbert Lang, 1974), p. 133.

9 The literature on Brecht's dramatic theories is extensive. In addition to his own Schriften zum Theater, published in three volumes, I have found the following studies useful: Ernest Borneman, "Credo Quia Absurdum: An Epitaph for Bertolt Brecht," Kenyon Review, 21 (1959), 169-198; Helge Hultberg, "Bert Brecht und Shakespeare," Orbis Litterarum, 14, 89-104; Humphrey Milnes, "The Concept of Man in Bertolt Brecht," University of Toronto Quarterly, 32 (1963), 217-228; Leroy R. Shaw, The Playwright and Historical Change (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), pp. 117-170; Gerald Weales, "Brecht and the Drama of Ideas," Ideas in the Drama: Selected Papers from the English Institute, ed. John Gassner (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), pp. 125-154; John Willett, The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht (New York: New Directions, 1964); and Andrzej Wirth, "Brecht and the Asiatic Model: The Secularization of Magical Rites," Literature East and West, 15, No. 4, 16, Nos. 1, 2 (combined issue December, 1971, March, 1972, and June, 1972), pp. 601-615.

10 Bertolt Brecht, Arbeitsjournal, ed. Werner Hecht (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1973), I, 272.

11 Bentley, "Introduction: Homage to Bert Brecht," Seven Plays by Bertolt Brecht, p. xliv.

12 "History, Drama and Brecht's Chronicle of the Thirty Years' War," Forum for Modern Language Studies, 6 (1970), 272.

13 Bertolt Brecht, Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder. Eine Chronik aus dem Dreissigjahrigen Krieg (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1968), p. 99. Subsequent references to the text from this edition shall be given in parentheses after the quotation.

14 Modern German Drama (London: Methuen, 1959), p. 213.

15 Bertolt Brecht, Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder: Materialien, comp. Werner Hecht (Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1968), pp. 138-139.

16 Brecht, Arbeitsjournal, II, 1004.

17 E. Speidel suggests in "The Mute Person's Voice: Mutter Courage and her Daughter," German Life and Letters, N.S. 23 (1970), 332-339, that Kattrin's silence is another instance of the twentieth-century concern with the "crisis of language," as presented in Hofmannsthal's "Lord Chandos Letter" and as analyzed by Wittgen-

stein. This may be correct in some larger sense, but to seek Wittgensteinian language philosophy in Brecht is to go astray.

18 "The Dear Purchase," German Quarterly, 41 (1966), 327.

19 On the Verfremdungseffekt of the songs, see Bernward Thole, Die "Gesänge" in den Stücken Bertolt Brechts. Zur Geschichte und Ästhetik des Liedes im Drama (Göppingen: Alfred Kümmerle, 1973), especially pp. 246-262.

20 Andrzej Wirth, "Die Funktion des Songs in Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder," Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder: Materialien, comp. Werner Hecht (Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1968), pp. 172-173.

21 Forum for Modern Language Studies, 6 (1970), 271.

22 "There is no final revolution, no final number," Yevgeny Zamyatin, "On Literature, Entropy and Other Matters," A Soviet Heretic: Essays, ed. and trans. Mirra Ginsberg (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 107.

CHAPTER VII

PERSPECTIVES: WAR AND THE LITERATURE OF WAR

The literary treatment of the Thirty Years' War is a problem which touches upon so many areas that it is not possible to exhaust it within the brief confines of a hundred pages. My conclusion is therefore less a claim to be final and definitive, if that is ever a valid claim for analyses of literature, than a summation of some answers to the initial questions, and an indication of some similarities among the authors examined. The principal questions put at the beginning of this study were how did the various authors conceive of the Thirty Years' War, and how did they communicate this conception? In each case, the treatment of the Thirty Years' War arose out of the interaction between a complex of variables including the author's attitude to war, his intentions with regard to his audience, the received image of the Thirty Years' War, and the literary techniques available to him.

For Grimmelshausen, the Thirty Years' War as a historical event was not of central concern, for it could reveal at best only the intentions of God, not men. He considered war to be a natural if unpleasant aspect of the world which could be made less frequent if people understood it properly. Proper understanding meant the realization that there are always two sides to war, that of the victor and that of the victim. Grimmelshausen did not portray the Thirty Years' War as such, but rather used war for didactic purposes, arguing that the conduct of war was incompatible with basic Christian principles. Lest his argument be insufficient,

he demonstrated with the progression of Simplicissimus through the world that only the most narrow of perspectives could permit one to do violence unto others.

Although he also mentioned the bad effects of the war, these were not Schiller's main concern. Schiller, as a philosopher and as a historian grappled with the problem presented by the abstraction of a coherent and orderly narrative of the past from the fragmentary evidence of documents. His solution was a brilliant manouevre past the problem. By selecting one key figure at one key moment and then subordinating the other events and figures to these, he was able to communicate an impression of historical unity and meaningfulness in his drama.

Schiller's successors in the nineteenth century were not quite capable of duplicating his feat in imposing a pattern upon the Thirty Years' War in literary works, and did not share his confidence. Instead, the very effort to deal with disorder--both actual and philosophical-literary disorder--became a determining theme, exaccerbated by both psychological strains and by the turbulent political situation of the times. Neither Droste-Hülshoff, nor Stifter, nor Meyer, nor Raabe had direct experience of war, but were all apprehensive that war might disrupt their quiet lives and those of their fellows. It is no accident therefore that the Thirty Years' War was recurringly depicted as a disruption or destruction which came from outside, which hovered just beyond the limits of the community. The fragile idyll could not be closed off against the din of war, even if the war itself was being held at bay. Whether it was the peaceful landscape of Westphalia,

the unmartial business office of the Leubelfings, the isolated castle of Clarissa and Johanna or the forest retreat in Elend, each was unsettled by the all-pervading influence of the Thirty Years' War. No real effort was made by these writers to analyze war as a human event: it appeared as a natural force in their works, as a storm or a wind beyond human comprehension or control. There was a conflict between the desire to somehow come to grips with reality and the unwillingness to face it, and an inherent element of escapism in the selection of the far distant past as the setting for a story. This is underscored by the fact that violence and brutality are generally alluded to rather than presented in concrete detail in these four works.

In contrast, one is almost overwhelmed by the mass of details presented by Döblin. The experience of World War I, with its senseless slaughter, left its mark on Döblin's treatment of the Thirty Years' War, both in the cold, objective discussion of the consequences of war, and in the overall impression that war is meaningless. Although one cannot speak of Döblin's Wallenstein as a purely didactic work, it does implicitly argue against the practice of war. One aspect which distinguishes Döblin's work from that of other presentations of the Thirty Years' War is the experimentation with expressionistic prose techniques in order to make the reader feel as well as understand cognitively the Thirty Years' War and its era.

Rather blunter in his didacticism was Döblin's contemporary, Brecht. Brecht was influenced by World War I too, but his analysis of war was coloured by Marxism. In his drama Mutter Courage,

Brecht tried to present the Marxist analysis of war as a manifestation of capitalism, to make the audience aware of its historical situation, and to urge the viewers to restructure their view of history. One can say that both Döblin and Brecht broke free of the nineteenth century concepts of historical literature, albeit for different reasons and with different results. Döblin leaves the reader with a mass of facts, details and disparate scenes whose sprawling formlessness is a statement in itself about the nature of historical reality, while Brecht's play strives to be an element of the audience's present, not to depict some illusory past.

By examining the various authors individually, one tends to over-emphasize their differences, but certain similarities do exist. First, none of these seven authors displays in his treatment of the Thirty Years' War an approval of war. They vary in the degree of their opposition to war from the intensity of Brecht and Grimmelshausen to the less explicit antipathy to war of Schiller and Meyer, but it is a constant element. Second, each of the authors re-interpreted the Thirty Years' War for his own time. As a consequence, the image of the Thirty Years' War underwent transformation and did not remain static. Even a relatively constant factor, such as the depiction of the brutality of war, changed from Grimmelshausen's stylizations to Döblin's scientific reports. A third common feature is the recurrence of the images used for the war, such as the hunt or games or war as commerce. These too were reworked and transformed. Grimmelshausen refers to dice in order to let Simplicissimus preach against the vice

of gambling, in Schiller the false dice are an objective correlative for the tragic drama, Droste-Hülshoff employs dice to hint at the Baroque concept of Fortuna, and Meyer fleshes out his story with accounts of board games, while Brecht focusses on the psychology of the gambler to communicate the psychology of the participant in war.

The full interpretation of such images of and for war would require a much larger and more widely selected group of texts than here. One ought to examine the treatment not only of the Thirty Years' War but of other wars in both German and non-German literature. Literary critics have generally given way to historians in the examination of such problems. This is unfortunate because in many respects the question of war is a literary question, for our principal knowledge of war is communicated through texts, and the bulk of our concepts of war are verbalized. Unless we are resigned to materialism, it must be of value to understand how such texts function and how concepts of war are brought into words. One example which might indicate the importance of literary analysis of accounts of war is the game imagery discussed above, when this is brought into conjunction with the fact that modern military strategists think of war in terms of games and game theory. There would seem to be a connection between what the poets have seen and what we see. If there is a relevance to our endeavours, surely it may be sought in making us aware of the connection.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources are listed first under the respective author.

A. General Works
B. Hans Jacob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen (?1621-1676)
C. Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805)
D. Annette von Droste-Hülshoff (1797-1848)
E. Adalbert Stifter (1805-1868)
F. Wilhelm Raabe (1831-1910)
G. Conrad Ferdinand Meyer (1825-1898)
H. Alfred Döblin (1878-1957)
I. Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956)

A. General Works

Adams, Robert P. The Better Part of Valor. More, Erasmus, Colet and Vives, on Humanism, War, and Peace. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962.

Alewyn, Richard. "Realismus und Naturalismus." Deutsche Barockforschung. Ed. R. Alewyn. Köln: Kiepenhauer und Witsch, 1965. Pp. 358-371.

Becker, Carl L. The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932.

Beller, Elmer A. Propaganda in Germany during the Thirty Years' War. Princeton: Princeton University Press/ London: Humphrey Milford, 1940.

Brinkmann, Richard. Wirklichkeit und Illusion. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1966.

Bürger, Gottfried August. Gedichte. Ed. A. Sauer. Berlin: W. Spemann, ?1883.

Danto, Arthur C. "Historical Language and Historical Reality." Review of Metaphysics, 27 (1973). 219-268.

Despland, Michael. Kant on History and Religion. Montreal/ London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1973.

Dornberg, Otto. "Grillparzer's Use of Historical Sources in König Ottokars Glück und Ende." Colloquia Germanica, 2 (1972). 165-178

Eggert, Hartmut. Studien zur Wirkungsgeschichte des deutschen historischen Romans 1850-1875. Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1971.

Erasmus. The Complaint of Peace. Trans. T. Paynell. London: Open Court, 1917.

Ergang, Robert. The Myth of the all-destructive fury of the Thirty Years' War. Pocono Pines, Pennsylvania: The Craftsment, 1953.

Friedrich, Carl J. The Age of the Baroque 1610-1660. New York: Harper, 1952.

Gibbs, Norman H, Thomas W. Wolfe and Claus D. Kernig. "War." Marxism, Communism and Western Society. A Comparative Encyclopedia. New York: Herder and Herder, 1973. VIII, 299-328.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. Werke. Ed. Wolfgang Kayser. Hamburg: Christian Wegner, 1962.

Grant, Damian. Realism. London: Methuen, 1970.

Herbst, Gisela. Die Entwicklung des Grimmelshausenbildes in der wissenschaftlichen Literatur. Bonn: H. Bouvier, 1957.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. Sämtliche Werke. Ed. Bernhard Suphan. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1891.

Hiller, Robert L. and John C. Osborne. "Introduction." The Runagate Courage. Trans. R.L. Hiller and J.C. Osborne. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965. Pp. 1-27.

Howald, Johann. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Konstanz: Carl Hirsch, ?1903.

Kamen, Henry A. "The Economic and Social Consequences of the Thirty Years' War." Past and Present, 39 (April 1968). 44-61.

Kluckhohn, Paul. "Biedermeier als literarische Epochenbezeichnung." DVjs, 13 (1935). 1-43.

Kluge, Friedrich. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. Ed. Walther Mitzka. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967.

Knobloch, Eberhard. Die Wortwahl in der archaisierenden chronikalischen Erzählung: Meinhold, Raabe, Storm, Wille, Kolbenheyer. Göppingen: Alfred Kümmerle, 1971.

Langan, Thomas. "The Future of Phenomenology." Phenomenology in Perspective. Ed. F.J. Smith. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970. Pp. 1-15.

Laue, Theodore H. von. Leopold Ranke, The Formative Years. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Levin, Harry. "What is Realism?" Comparative Literature, 3 (1951). 193-199.

Lukacs, Georg. The Historical Novel. Trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.

Luther, Arthur. Deutsche Geschichte in deutscher Erzählung. Ein literarisches Lexikon. Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1943.

Mann, Golo. "Geschichtsschreibung als Literatur." Jahrbuch der Deutschen Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung. Darmstadt, 1964. 103-124. Rept. in Methodenfragen der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft. Ed. Reinhold Grimm and Jost Hermand. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973. 428-449.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. "Some Observations on Causes of War in Ancient Historigraphy." Studies in Historiography. A. Momigliano. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966. Pp. 112-126.

Montross, Lynn. War Through the Ages. New York/ London: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Munz, Peter. "The Skeleton and the Mollusc: Reflections on the Nature of Historical Narratives." New Zealand Journal of History, 1 (1967). 107-123.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. Werke. Eds. Giorgio Colli and Mazzio Montinari. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968.

Norst, Marlene J. "Biedermeier." Periods in German Literature. Ed. James M. Ritchie. London: Oswald Wolff, 1968. Pp. 147-170.

Palmer, Robert R. and Joel Colton. A History of the Modern World. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.

Paret, Peter. "The History of War." Historical Studies Today. Eds. Felix Gilbert and Stephen R. Graubard. New York: W. W. Norton, 1972. Pp. 372-391.

Patrides, C. A. The Grand Design of God. The Literary Form of the Christian View of History. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

Price, Lawrence M. The Reception of English Literature in Germany. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932.

Rabb, Theodore K. "The Effects of the Thirty Years' War on the German Economy." The Journal of Modern History, 34 (1962). 40-51.

Raleigh, John H. "What Scott Meant to the Victorians." Victorian Studies, 7 (1963). 8-34.

Ritchie, James M. "The Ambivalence of 'Realism' in German Literature, 1830-1880." Orbis Litterarum, 15 (1960). 100-217.

Rystad, Göran. Kriegsnachrichten und Propaganda während des Dreissigjährigen Krieges. Die Schlacht bei Nördlingen in den gleichzeitigen gedruckten Kriegsberichten. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1960.

Schulz-Behrend, George. "German Literature to Goethe." German Language and Literature: Seven Essays. Ed. Karl S. Weimar. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1974. Pp. 65-124.

Shaw, Renata V. "Broadsides of the Thirty Years' War." Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress, 32 (1975). 2-24.

Simon, Karl. "Biedermeier in der bildenden Kunst." DVjs, 13 (1935). 59-90.

Steinberg, S. H. "Thirty Years War." The New Encyclopedia Britannica, Macropedia. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1973. XVIII, 333-344.

_____. "The Thirty Years' War: A New Interpretation." History, 32 (1947). 89-102.

_____. The "Thirty Years' War" and the Conflict for European Hegemony 1600-1660. London: Edward Arnold, 1966.

Stempel, Wolf-Dieter. "Erzählung, Beschreibung und der Historische Diskurs." Geschichte--Ereignis und Erzählung. Eds. Reinhart Koselleck and Wolf-Dieter Stempel. München: Wilhelm Fink, 1973. Pp. 325-346.

Studentkowski, Konrad. Der dreissigjährige Krieg im Spiegel der historischen Novelle. Ein Beitrag zur Stoffgeschichte und zur Geschichte der historischen Novelle. Jena: Fromannsche Buchhandlung, 1934.

Vosskamp, Wilhelm. Zeit- und Geschichtsauffassung im 17. Jahrhundert bei Gryphius und Lohenstein. Bonn: H. Bouvier, 1967.

Wagener, Hans. The German Baroque Novel. New York: Twayne, 1973.

Wellek, René. "The Concept of Realism in Literary Scholarship." Neophilologus, 35 (1961). 1-20.

Wells, George A. The Plays of Grillparzer. London: Pergamon Press, 1969.

Wetherill, Peter M. The Literary Text: An Examination of Critical Methods. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974.

White, Hayden. Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe. Baltimore/ London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Wundt, Max. "Die Philosophie in der Zeit des Biedermeiers." DVjs, 13 (1935). 118-148.

Zamyatin, Yevgeny. A Soviet Heretic: Essays. Ed. and trans. Mirra Ginsberg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

B. Hans Jacob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen (?1621-1676)

Grimmelshausen, Hans Jacob Christoffel von. Der Abentheuerliche Simplicissimus Teutsch und Continuatio des abentheuerlichen Simplicissimi. Ed. Rolf Tarot. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1967.

_____. Satyrischer Pilgram. Ed. Wolfgang Bender. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1970.

Eichendorff, Joseph Freiherr von. Werke und Schriften. IV: Literaturhistorische Schriften, Historische Schriften, Politische Schriften. Ed. Gerhard Baumann with Siegfried Grosse. Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1958.

Heselhaus, Clemens. "Der abenteuerliche Simplicissimus." Der deutsche Roman vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart. Struktur und Geschichte. Ed. Benno von Wiese. Düsseldorf: August Bagel, 1963. I, 15-63.

Könnecke, Gustav. Quellen und Forschungen zur Lebensgeschichte Grimmelshausens. 2 vols. Weimar: Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen, 1926.

Knight, Kenneth G. "Grimmelshausen's Simplicissimus--a popular Baroque novel." Periods in German Literature. II: Texts and Contexts. Ed. James M. Ritchie. London: Oswald Wolff, 1969. Pp. 3-22.

Müller, Klaus-Detlef. "Die Kleidermetapher in Grimmelshausen's Simplicissimus. Ein Beitrag zur Struktur des Romans." DVjs, 44 (1970). 20-46.

Parker, Alexander A. Literature and the Delinquent. The Picaresque Novel in Spain and Europe, 1599-1753. Edinburgh: University Press, 1967.

Ritchie, James M. "Grimmelshausen's Simplicissimus and the Runagate Courage." Knaves and Swindlers. Essays on the

Picaresque Novel in Europe. Ed. Christine J. Whitbourn. London: Oxford University Press for the University of Hull, 1974. Pp. 48-74.

Schmidt, Lothar. "Das Ich im Simplicissimus." Wirkendes Wort, 10 (1960). 215-220.

Speier, Hans. "Introduction." Hans Jacob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen. Courage, the Adventures and the False Messiah. Trans. Hans Speier. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964. Pp. 3-79.

Welzig, Werner. Beispielhafte Figuren. Tor, Abenteurer und Einsiedler bei Grimmelshausen. Graz: H. Böhlau, 1963.

Weydt, Günther. Nachahmung und Schöpfung im Barock. Studien um Grimmelshausen. Bern: Francke, 1968.

C. Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805)

Schiller, Friedrich. Werke. Nationalausgabe. VIII: Wallenstein. Ed. Hermann Schneider and Lieselotte Blumenthal. Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1949.

Berghahn, Klaus L. "'Das Pathetischerhabene': Schillers Dramentheorie." Deutsche Dramentheorien. Beiträge zu einer historischen Poetik des Dramas in Deutschland. Ed. Reinhold Grimm. Frankfurt a.M.: Athenäum, 1971. I, 214-244.

Garland, Henry B. Schiller the Dramatic Writer. A Study of Style in the Plays. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Göpfert, Herbert G. "Anmerkungen." Friedrich Schiller. Historische Schriften. II: Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Kriegs. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1966. Pp. 365-375.

Hahn, Karl-Heinz. "Die Bewertung der historischen Rolle Wallensteins durch Schiller." Weimarer Beiträge, 5, Supplement (1959). 205-208.

_____. "Schiller und die Geschichte." Weimarer Beiträge, 16 (1970). 39-69.

Hartmann, Horst. Wallenstein. Geschichte und Dichtung. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1969.

Heselhaus, Clemens. "Wallensteinisches Welttheater." Deutschunterricht, 12, No. 2 (1960). 42-71.

Mann, Golo. "Schiller als Historiker." Schiller. Reden im

Gedenkjahr 1959. Ed. Bernhard Zeller. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1961. Pp. 102-123.

Miller, Ronald D. Schiller and the Ideal of Freedom. A Study of Schiller's Philosophical Works with Chapters on Kant. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.

Neubauer, John. "The Idea of History in Schiller's Wallenstein." Neophilologus, 56 (1972). 451-463.

Purdie, Edna. "Schiller." Schiller Bicentenary Lectures. Ed. F. Norman. London: University of London Institue of Germanic Languages and Literature, 1960. Pp. 1-23.

Regin, Deric. Freedom and Dignity. The Historical and Philosophical Thought of Schiller. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965.

Seidlin, Oskar. "Schiller: Poet of Politics." A Schiller Symposium In Observance of the Bicentenary of Schiller's Birth. Ed. A. Leslie Wilson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960. Pp. 31-50.

Spender, Stephen. "Schiller, Shakespeare and the Theme of Power." A Schiller Symposium in Observance of the Bicentenary of Schiller's Birth. Ed. A. Leslie Wilson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960. Pp. 51-64.

Wiese, Benno von. "Schiller as Philosopher of History and as Historian." Schiller Bicentenary Lectures. Ed. F. Norman. London: University of London Institute of Germanic Languages and Literature, 1960. Pp. 83-103.

D. Annette von Droste-Hülshoff (1797-1848)

Droste-Hülshoff, Annette von. Sämtliche Werke. Ed. Clemens Heselhaus. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962.

Bonati-Richner, Silvia. Der Feuermensch. Studien über das Verhältnis von Mensch und Landschaft in den erzählenden Werken der Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. Bern: Francke, 1972.

Gössmann, Wilhelm. "Das politische Zeitbewusstsein der Droste." Jahrbuch der Drostegesellschaft, 5 (1972). 102-122.

Hallamore, Joyce. "The Reflected Self in Annette von Droste's Work: A Challenge to Self-Discovery." Monatshefte, 61 (1969). 59-74.

Häntschel, Günter. Tradition und Originalität. Allegorische Darstellung im Werk Annette von Droste-Hülshoffs. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1968.

Heselhaus, Clemens. Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. Werk und Leben. Düsseldorf: August Bagel, 1971.

Lavater-Sloman, Mary. Einsamkeit. Das Leben der Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. Zürich: Artemis, 1964.

Mare, Margaret. Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. London: Methuen, 1965.

Muschler, Reinhold Conrad. "Vorwort." Briefe von Annette von Droste-Hülshoff und Levin Schücking. Ed. R.C. Muschler. Leipzig: Fr. Wilhelm Grunow, 1928. Pp. vii-xxxi.

Schatzky, Brigitte E. Annette von Droste-Hülshoff." German Men of Letters. Ed. Alex Natan. London: Oswald Wolff, 1961. I, 79-98.

Silz, Walter. "Problems of 'Weltanschauung' in the Works of Annette von Droste-Hülshoff." PMLA, 64 (1949). 678-700.

E. Adalbert Stifter (1805-1868)

Stifter, Adalbert. "Der Hochwald." Erzählungen in der Urfassung. Ed. Max Stefl. Augsburg: Adam Kraft, 1950. Pp. 257-360.

Babcock, Leland S. "Concepts of the Good Life in Stifter's Early Works." Diss. University of Califronia, 1950.

Pascal, Roy. "Die Landschaftsschilderung im Hochwald." Adalbert Stifter Studien und Interpretationen. Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage. Ed. Lothar Stiehm. Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm, 1968. Pp. 57-68.

Steffen, Konrad. Adalbert Stifter. Deutungen. Basel/ Stuttgart: Birkhauser, 1955.

Stern, Joseph P. "Adalbert Stifter: 'Erhebung without Motion.'" Idylls and Realities. New York: F. Ungar, 1971. Pp. 97-122.

Zoldester, Philip H. Adalbert Stiftera Weltanschauung. Bern: Herbert Lang, 1970.

F. Wilhelm Raabe (1831-1910)

Raabe, Wilhelm. "Else von der Tanne." Sämtliche Werke. Eds. Karl Hoppe, Hans Oppermann, and Hans Plischke. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962. IX, part 1, 159-198.

_____. "Pro domo." Sämtliche Werke. Eds. Karl Hoppe, Hans Op-

permann, and Hans Plischke. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1965. I, 9-10.

Brate, Gertrud. "Form und Inhalt in Wilhelm Raabes 'Else von der Tanne oder das Glück Domini Friedemann Leutenbachers, Armen Dieners am Wort Gottes zu Wallrode im Elend'." Jahrbuch der Raabegesellschaft (1973). Pp. 54-70.

Killy, Walther. "Geschichte gegen die Geschichte. Das Odfeld." Raabe in neuer Sicht. Ed. Hermann Helmers. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1968. Pp. 229-246.

King, Janet K. "Raabe's 'Else von der Tanne.'" The German Quarterly, 40 (1967). 653-663.

Neumann, Friedrich. "Erlebte Geschichte in Raabes Erzählung 'Im Siegeskranze'." Jahrbuch der Raabegesellschaft (1962). Pp. 108-120.

Pascal, Roy. The German Novel. Studies. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956. Pp. 143-177.

Radcliffe, Stanley. "Wilhelm Raabe, the Thirty Years' War and the Novelle." German Life and Letters, N.S. 22 (1969). 220-229.

Schlegel, Wolfgang. "Über Wilhelm Raabes Geschichtsbild. Vorbemerkungen zu einer neuen Forschungsaufgabe." Jahrbuch der Raabegesellschaft (1962). Pp. 22-31.

Schrader, Hans-Jürgen. "Zur Vergegenwärtigung und Interpretation der Geschichte bei Raabe." Jahrbuch der Raabegesellschaft (1973). Pp. 12-53.

G. Conrad Ferdinand Meyer (1825-1898)

Meyer, Conrad Ferdinand. "Gustav Adolfs Page." Sämtliche Werke in zwei Bänden. München: Winckler, 1968. I, 132-172.

Brunet, Georges. C.F. Meyer et la Nouvelle. Paris: Didier, 1967.

Burkhard, Arthur and Henry H. Stevens. "Conrad Ferdinand Meyer Reveals Himself. A Critical Examination of 'Gustav Adolfs Page'." Germanic Review, 15 (1940). 191-212.

Ermatinger, Emil. "Eine Quelle zu Konrad Ferdinand Meyers 'Gustav Adolfs Page'." Das literarische Echo, 19, No. 1 (1916). Cols. 22-26.

Fehr, Karl. Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1971.

Moos, Carlo. Dasein als Erinnerung. Conrad Ferdinand Meyer und

die Geschichte. Bern: Herbert Lang, 1973.

Williams, William D. The Stories of C.F. Meyer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Yuill, W.E. "Conrad Ferdinand Meyer." German Men of Letters. Ed. Alex Natan. London: Oswald Wolff, 1961. I, 195-214.

H. Alfred Döblin (1878-1957)

Döblin, Alfred. "Schriftstellerei und Dichtung." Jahrbuch der Sektion für Dichtkunst. Preussische Akademie der Künste. Berlin: S. Fischer, 1929. Pp. 70-81.

_____. "Von Leben und Tod, die es beide nicht gibt. Aus nachgelassenen Diktaten." Sinn und Form, 9 (1957). 902-933.

_____. Wallenstein. 2 vols. Berlin: S. Fischer, 1920.

Casey, Timothy J. "Alfred Döblin." Expressionismus als Literatur. Gesammelte Studien. Ed. Wolfgang Rothe. Bern: Francke, 1969. Pp. 637-655.

Eykman, Christoph. Geschichtspessimismus in der deutschen Literatur des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. Bern: Francke, 1970. Pp. 42-57.

Grass, Günter. "Über meinen Lehrer Döblin." Akzente, 14 (1967). 290-309.

Loerke, Oskar. "Alfred Döblins Werk 1928." Gedichte und Prosa. II: Die Schriften. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1958. Pp. 560-604.

Minder, Robert. "Alfred Döblin." Deutsche Literatur im 20. Jahrhundert. Strukturen und Gestalten. Eds. Otto Mann and Wolfgang Rothe. 5th rev. ed. Bern: Francke, 1967. II, 126-150.

Peitz, Wolfgang. "Ich-Erfahrung und Weltverständigung bei Alfred Döblin." Language and Style, 3 (1970). 38-50.

Rasch, Wolfdietrich. "Döblins Wallenstein und die Geschichte." Zur deutschen Literatur seit der Jahrhundertwende. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1967. Pp. 228-242.

Ziolkowski, Theodore. Dimensions of the Modern Novel. German Texts and European Contexts. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Žmegač, Viktor. "Alfred Döblins Poetik des Romans." Deutsche Romantheorien. Ed. Reinhold Grimm. Frankfurt a.M.:

Athenäum, 1968. Pp. 297-320.

I. Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956)

Brecht, Bertolt. Arbeitsjournal. 2 vols. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1973.

_____. Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder. Eine Chronik aus dem Dreissigjährigen Krieg. 9th ed. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1968.

_____. Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder: Materialien. Comp. Werner Hecht. Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1968.

_____. Schriften zum Theater. 3 vols. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1967.

Bentley, Eric. "Introduction: Homage to Bert Brecht." Seven Plays by Bertolt Brecht. Ed. Eric Bentley. New York: Grove Press, 1961. Pp. xi-li.

Borneman, Ernest. "Credo Quia Absurdum: An Epitaph for Bertolt Brecht." Kenyon Review, 21 (1959). 169-198.

Dickson, Keith A. "History, Drama and Brecht's Chronicle of the Thirty Years' War." Forum for Modern Language Studies, 6 (1970). 255-273.

Esslin, Martin. Brecht, the Man and His Work. Garden City: Doubleday, 1960.

Garten, Hugh F. Modern German Drama. 2nd rev. ed. London: Methuen, 1964.

Grimm, Reinhold. "Brechts Anfänge." Aspekte des Expressionismus. Periodisierung-Stil-Gedankenwelt. Ed. Wolfgang Paulsen. Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm, 1968. Pp. 133-152.

Hultberg, Helge. "Bert Brecht und Shakespeare." Orbis Litterarum, 14 (1959). 89-104.

Milfull, John. From Brecht to Keuner. The "Second Optimism" of Bertolt Brecht. Bern: Herbert Lang, 1974.

Milnes, Humphrey. "The Concept of Man in Bertolt Brecht." University of Toronto Quarterly, 32 (1963). 217-228.

Schulz, Gudrun. Die Schillerbearbeitungen Bertolt Brechts. Eine Untersuchung literaturhistorischer Bezüge im Hinblick auf Brechts Traditionsbegriff. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1972.

Shaw, Leroy R. The Playwright and Historical Change. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970.

Speidel, E. "The Mute Person's Voice: Mutter Courage and Her Daughter." German Life and Letters, N.S. 23 (1970). 332-339.

Stern, Joseph P. "The Dear Purchase." German Quarterly, 41 (1968). 317-335.

Thole, Bernward. Die "Gesänge" in den Stücken Bertolt Brechts. Zur Geschichte und Ästhetik des Liedes im Drama. Göppingen: Alfred Kümmerle, 1973.

Weales, Gerald. "Brecht and the Drama of Ideas." Ideas in the Drama. Selected Papers from the English Institute. Ed. John Gassner. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964. Pp. 125-154.

Willett, John. The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht. New York: New Directions, 1964.

Wirth, Andrzej. "Brecht and the Asiatic Model: The Secularization of Magical Rites." Literature East and West, 15, No. 4; 16, Nos. 1 and 2 (combined issue December, 1971, March, 1972 and June, 1972). 601-615.

_____. "Die Funktion des Songs in Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder." Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder: Materialien. Comp. Werner Hecht. Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1968. Pp. 169-174.

APPENDIX: A BRIEF CHRONOLOGY OF THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR

1608 Union of Protestant princes in the Empire formed under leadership of Frederick IV, Elector Palatine

1609 League of Catholic princes under leadership of Maximilian of Bavaria formed
Rudolf II grants Letter of Majesty to Bohemia

1612 Matthias Emperor

1618 Revolt in Bohemia

1619 Death of Matthias. Ferdinand of Styria becomes Emperor. Frederick V, Elector Palatine (son-in-law of James I of England), replaces deposed Ferdinand

1620 Frederick V defeated by Tilly, Maximilian's general, at the battle of the White Mountain

1621 Conquest of the Palatine begins

1623 Maximilian of Bavaria takes over the Electorate of the Palatinate; Christian of Halberstadt defeated by Tilly in the Battle of Stadtlohn

1624 Albrecht von Wallenstein, a Bohemian nobleman, raises an independent imperial army for Ferdinand; is made Duke of Friedland

1625 Christian IV, King of Denamrk, enters the war

1626 Wallenstein defeats Mansfeld; Tilly defeats Christian IV

1628 Wallenstein General of the Oceanic and Baltic Seas, unsuccessfully besieges Stralsund

1629 Treaty of Lübeck takes Denmark out of the war. Edict of Restitution orders restoration of all Church lands taken over by Protestants since 1552

1630 Electoral Diet at Regensburg; Wallenstein dismissed. Gustavus Adolphus lands in Germany.

1631 Tilly sacks Magdeburg; Gustavus defeats Tilly at Breitenfeld; Wallenstein recalled by Ferdinand

1632 Gustavus defeats Tilly, and is in turn killed at the battle of Lützen, although the Swedes win

1633 Confederation of Heilbronn; Wallenstein negotiates with Saxony, Sweden, and Bohemian exiles

1634 Ferdinand dismisses Wallenstein, who is murdered at Eger; Swedes are defeated at the battle of Nördlingen

1635 Treaty of Prague. Full scale intervention of France

1636 Battle of Wittstock. Baner defeats the Imperialists

1637 Death of Ferdinand II

1641 First major discussions of peace at Hamburg

1642 Second battle of Breitenfeld: Swedish victory

1643 Negotiations for peace between Sweden and Emperor begin at Osnabrück

1644 Battle of Freiburg; defeat of French by Bavaria
Negotiations for peace between Emperor and France begin at Münster

1645 Second battle of Nördlingen: French and Swedes defeat Bavaria and the Emperor

1648 Bavaria devastated; Swedes reach Prague; treaties signed in Westphalia giving gains to France and Sweden

1651 Death of Maximilian of Bavaria